THE LIBERATOR.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY, AT THE
ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 21 CORNHILL.

Robert F. Wallcut, General Agent.

☞ TERMS—$2 50 per annum, in advance.
☞ All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be directed (POST PAID) to the General Agent.
☞ Six copies will be sent to one address for TEN DOLLARS, if payment be forwarded in advance.
☞ Advertisements making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cts.—one square for $1 00.

Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELLIS GRAY LORING, EDMUND QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILBRICK, WENDELL PHILLIPS. [This Committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper—not for any of its debts.]

THE LIBERATOR

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

THE U. S. CONSTITUTION 'A COVENANT WITH DEATH AND AN AGREEMENT WITH HELL.'

☞ 'Yes! it cannot be denied—the slaveholding lords of the South prescribed, as a condition of their assent to the Constitution, three special provisions to secure the perpetuity of their dominion over their slaves. The first was the immunity, for twenty years, of preserving the African slave trade; the second was the stipulation to surrender fugitive slaves—an engagement positively prohibited by the laws of God, delivered from Sinai; and thirdly, the exaction, fatal to the principles of popular representation, of a representation for slaves—for articles of merchandize, under the name of persons. . . Its reciprocal operation upon the government of the nation is, to establish an artificial majority in the slave representation over that of the free people, in the American Congress, and hereby to make the PRESERVATION, PROPAGATION AND PERPETUATION OF SLAVERY THE VITAL AND ANIMATING SPIRIT OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.'—JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR. OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. J. B. YERRINTON & SON, PRINTERS.

VOL XX. NO. 17. BOSTON, MASS., FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1850. WHOLE NO. 1007.

Refuge of Oppression.

From the Journal of Commerce.

POLITICS AND THE PULPIT.

If there are objections against clergymen's meddling with politics out of the pulpit, what shall be said of those who bring politics into the pulpit, on the Sabbath? Of such there are many. Not that they bring into the pulpit *mere* party politics, although in some cases there is a near approximation to it. Free Soilism, used in its technical, party sense, expresses the idea in black and white. What we mean to say, then, is, that many clergymen, at this day, preach Free Soilism, and pray Free Soilism, on the Sabbath; and we mean to say, that this is an outrage upon the Sabbath and upon the pulpit: an abuse of privilege; and affords a congregation just ground of complaint, and if persisted in, of repudiation. In proof of what we assert, we appeal to the experience of thousands of our readers. We also appeal to a religious paper in this city, avowedly edited by three distinguished Congregational ministers, and receiving editorial contributions from a fourth, and how many more we know not.

* * * * *

The provision of the Constitution, respecting fugitive slaves, is at present inoperative, by reason of the imperfection of existing laws. Congress propose to pass a new law which shall reach the case. The Independent tells them it '*shall not*' be carried into effect. What is this but preaching rebellion, both against the Constitution and laws? This bold and shameless doctrine the 'Independent' justifies on the ground that 'man cannot plant parchments as deep as God plants principles.' Agreed. But one of the 'principles' of God's law is, obedience to civil governments. Another is, the obedience of servants [slaves, as is shown by the context] to their masters. With these 'principles' before him, a man, and especially a minister of the gospel, needs to examine its ground very carefully, before he makes up his mind to resist the laws of his country. Even then, it does not follow that he is bound to exhort others to do so. A question between his own conscience and his Maker is not a question between other people's consciences and their Maker. Besides, the doctrine of rebellion for conscience sake (though we admit its correctness in supposable cases) strikes at the foundation of all human laws. If admitted as a justification of rebellion, probably not one of the edifices preached in by the editors of the 'Independent' would stand three days. Even their own lives might not be safe. In a world as wicked as this, no class of men owe more to the protection of human laws than evangelical Christians, and especially clergymen. They cannot afford to rest that protection on a basis so frail as *conscience*, which, with many persons, is synonymous with judgment or opinion, or perhaps with *will*.

It is a singular and instructive fact, that these extra sticklers for the rights of conscience in their own case, are, of all men in the world, the least indulgent towards the consciences of *others*. Claiming full liberty to over-ride the Constitution and laws, whenever their own consciences require it, they at the same time set down every man who differs from themselves as either dishonest or conscience-seared. They discard all slaveholders, refusing to commune with them, and excluding them, if ministers, from their pulpits. If Philemon, whom the apostle Paul called 'our dearly beloved,' and to whom he wrote, 'I thank my God, making mention of thee always in my prayers, hearing of thy love and faith which thou hast towards the Lord Jesus, and towards all saints'—if Philemon was alive and in this country, they would refuse to commune with him. Why should such holy men have any thing to do with 'man-stealers' and 'robbers'? Next they denounce all Northern men who cannot go the full length with themselves on the slavery question, as 'pro-slavery,' and the more conscious any one becomes by his position as the exponent of moderate views, the more abundantly are their vials of wrath poured out upon him. If a reaction against the Wilmot Proviso and its associate humbugs commences in the large cities, where almost every important movement commences, they denounce the merchants as a set of money-makers, whose interests have blinded their judgments, or who have sacrificed their conscience to filthy lucre.

We should like to ask these editors, who made you judges of another man's conscience? Can you not conceive it possible, that in some things you may be mistaken? But admitting that you are infallible, like the Pope, whose tone you too much imitate, is it not a supposable case, that those who differ from you may at least be conscientious in their opinions? You have seen that this very speech of Mr. Webster, which you regard with so much horror, has elicited the warmest approval of some of the wisest and best men of the nation; of those venerable theologians, eminent alike for talents, learning and piety, Reverend Dr. Woods and Reverend Professor Stuart, of Andover; of Honorable Samuel T. Armstrong, long distinguished in the religious community of Boston, and whose last act, almost, before he was translated to the better world, was to sign the letter of thanks to Mr. Webster; of Perkins, Jackson, and a host besides of the greatest and best men of Boston; of thousands of the most upright and intelligent men in this city; that, in short, the sentiments of that speech are fast becoming the sentiments of an immense body of people at the North, in many cases against their preconceived opinions and prejudices. In view of these facts, we ask again, can you not, by a special effort of charity, imagine that some one of all these people may have 'a good conscience, void of offence, towards God and towards men'? But remember, if one may, all may, for aught you can say to the contrary, and it may follow that you are defamers and slanderers of better men than yourselves. If so, the wrong is the greater, because you give them no chance to be heard in self-defence. You publish Seward's speech on an Era, and land it to the skies; but Webster's you misuse and vilify, without publishing. Is this equal justice? Is it justice at all? Would not even 'the moral sense of callous politicians' shrink from it? We think it would.

We close this rather desultory article with the following paragraph, comprising the substance of some remarks made by a clergyman in Brooklyn, two Sundays ago, immediately after the sermon, and before the last prayer. It was written down from memory by a member of the congregation, and has since been submitted to other members, who confirm its general correctness:—

'As to the sincerity of Mr. Clay's compron had no doubt. He wished he could say as mu he Mr. Webster, but *he* had acted like a fool. The gr ly ground assumed by Mr. Seward in vindicating *strict right* as superior to all constitutions made man, he could not too highly commend. For himself, he was no politician. He had no sympathy with politicians. Their dishonesty was universal. He believed that God hated them. And he rejoiced that there was one man among the host of trucklers to *expediency*, who dared to stand forth (although reproved by Mr. Cass) and do right.'

Now, for a minister of the gospel, in his pulpit, on the Sabbath day, to use such language in regard to the greatest of living statesmen, or in regard to any man, appears to us so exceedingly reprehensible, that we dare not trust ourselves to characterise it as it deserves. Others of his remarks are scarcely less objectionable. Clergymen ought to understand, that while they attend to the proper duties of their calling, they will be respected, honored and beloved; but that if they descend to the arena of politics, their black coats will most likely be rolled in the dirt. The peaceable, quiet men of more congregations than one, are becoming very much dissatisfied with the course of their pastors in regard to the slavery question, and it is to be feared that separations will ensue in consequence. Ministers should recollect that one abolitionist makes more noise than twenty quiet members, and that consequently they are very liable to be deceived as to the real sentiments of the congregation. The quiet ones only speak out when they can stand it no longer.

REGAPTURE OF FUGITIVE SLAVES.

The idea of surrendering fugitive slaves, is, we own, repugnant to the general sentiment of the North; but that is not the question. The question is, 'What is in the bond? what have we stipulated?' The language of the Constitution is so clear that it admits of no evasion. Even Governor Seward does not attempt to evade it; though he seeks to diminish its force by saying it is 'only a compact.' Yes, it is 'ONLY a compact;' the most solemn that ever was entered into between man and man. A thousand oaths would not increase its solemnity. The question returns, 'Will we fulfil our promise? will we redeem our plighted faith? or will we be recreant to both?' We have no right to dissect the Constitution, and say we will accept this provision, and reject that. We are already full partners in the concern, entitled to all its benefits, and subject to all its risks. We cannot be more nor less than this, except by the process prescribed by the contract itself. We are bound by the whole contract, and by every part of it. Every citizen is so bound; nor can he escape from his obligations by a mere act of the will. He may violate them, but cannot escape from them. If we wish the contract annulled, it would be more honorable to agitate for a 'peaceable dissolution of the Union,' along with Garrison and his confederates, than to pursue the sneaking, pilfering policy which too many seem inclined to adopt, including some from whom better things might be expected.

For ourselves, we go for the Constitution, and the whole Constitution. We are solemnly bound by it, and will honor the bond. The necessity of surrendering fugitive slaves we regret, but cannot avoid. Whatever the Constitution requires of us in that matter, we will perform, unless we shall become convinced, (which we are not at present,) that it is clearly contrary to the law of God. On this point we cannot overlook the fact that when Onesimus, the slave of Philemon, ran away from his master, and fled to Rome, where he was converted under the instructions of Paul, then a prisoner, the latter did not smuggle him off by the underground railroad, nor conceal him in some garret or cellar of the metropolis, but sent him back to his master, with a most courteous, affectionate and christian letter, 'beseeching' Philemon to set Onesimus at liberty; but at the same time promising, over his own signature, to pay him whatever might be due by Onesimus, (whether including service or not, does not distinctly appear from the record,) and to indemnify him for any wrong which the latter might have committed. Our own views in reference to this matter are just like Paul's, as expressed in his letter to Philemon.—*Ibid.*

The Liberator.

LETTER TO DANIEL WEBSTER.

PORTLAND, April 18, 1850.

SIR:

From your high place in the Senate of the United States, you have spoken to the people of your country and the world. The nation has stood breathless with expectation, hope and fear, to listen to your voice. It is, therefore, of small importance to you, who the obscure individual may be who presumes to address you, in terms such as he once hoped could never, with truth, be applied to you. One who desired that you, above all other men, should occupy the chair of the Chief Magistrate of this nation. One who has been second to no other man in admiration of your eminent abilities, and who has looked upon Daniel Webster as second to no man living: but who would not now exchange his present identity, with its obscurity, small endowments, and smaller wordly expectations, to be Daniel Webster as he is, or as he *ever shall be*. One among the millions who have admired you, but one who has never idolized any man, nor any nation, nor any government, nor any institution, nor any CONSTITUTION. One among the millions who are now called to sit in judgment upon your acts, and whose conscience being governed by moral rather than political considerations, cannot fail to condemn your course.

It would be an idle task to attempt to convince you that you have changed your position, because, being 'godlike,' you are unchangeable. You tell us there is no change in your sentiments. I believe you. You say there is no inconsistency between your declarations recently made in the Senate and former ones. You know better, Sir; and you know that the American people know better. You speak of the oath to support the Constitution as so awfully sacred that it is impossible to suppose that you can believe any sin equal in magnitude to a disregard of this one thing, so that it is not suprising that moral considerations should be utterly contemptible in your eyes. It is plain, that as you believe in no other than constitutional sins, right and wrong can never be determined, in your judgment, with mathematical certainty, by any moral or self-evident test, but must be ascertained only by an appeal to the Constitution.

But, Sir, it were equally idle to enter into any controversy with you upon a constitutional question—far from me be such presumption. It is a point on which there is no essential constitutional disagreement between you and the people of the free States, that you are to be judged. You will not deny, because you never change, that it is constitutional for Congress to provide for the personal liberty of every person wherever the United States Government possesses legislative authority. You will not deny that it would be constitutional to secure the right of trial by jury to every person claimed as a fugitive from service or labor. Upon these two points, there is no constitutional disagreement.

At a period when universal, individual, personal liberty is the great question that convulses the civilized world, and you can look over Europe, and denounce despotism, and exultingly applaud the efforts of the oppressed to break their political fetters, [illegible] through blood and death to liberty, and sympathize with the unsuccessful efforts of the insurgents in other lands, 'tis passing strange that you have no spirit of condemnation to utter against the despotic powers you can denounce the tyranny of the governments of Europe, for endeavoring to crush out the spirit of freedom in their subjects, 'tis marvellous that you can support, to its fullest extent, with all its provisions, the execrable attempt of a most despotic minority of your own countrymen to place their impious feet upon the necks of the millions of freemen as well as slaves within the boundaries of this Republic.

'Slavery and Liberty, and the Wrong and Right have met,
To decide their ancient quarrel'—

and Daniel Webster, the 'godlike,' who has so often sported the name of Liberty on his tongue, and sounded its praises when striving to establish its dominion among 'the rest of mankind,' brings his vast power to the aid of its deadly foe at home, and refuses to 'reenact the will of God,' lest it should irritate the vindictive spirit of slavery, which at this very hour we possess the power, but only lack the will to crush.

And wherefore? You have said you seek not protection behind the purity of your motives; but you present to us as your motive, the desire to preserve the integrity of the Union. Your language once was, LIBERTY AND UNION; but now it appears to be UNION, with or without LIBERTY. You apprehend that the hundred thousand tyrants will not submit to the millions of the free spirits of the free States, if the Constitution is used to secure the triumph of Liberty; so that slavery shall perish of its own inherent weakness. You fear that the slaveholders will dissolve the Union. Sir, had you any such fear? Doubted; but what then? What is there so sacred in the government of which you form a part, what so holy in the Union of these States, that the sympathies and common sense of mankind must be reversed to save it, and Liberty be sacrificed to its preservation? Think you, Sir, that to the Austrian Emperor and the Russian Czar, the perpetuity of their powers and their governments does not appear equally sacred, to justify the sacrifice of human rights to their preservation, as is the Union of these States in your estimation, and the peculiar institution of the South in the estimation of the traffickers in human flesh? What is there, I repeat, so holy in the Union in your eyes, that Liberty must die the death to preserve it, and seek through blood and fire a resurrection in the old world, where the despotisms of centuries have acquired all the sacredness of time-honored institutions, which no impious tongue, speaking 'out of the abundance of a free heart,' shall with impunity blaspheme?

Charity would indeed incline us to the belief, that an unselfish patriotism is the only motive which impels the American Jupiter to pocket his own thunder, and promise the Nimrods who declare it will rive the Union that the bolt shall never fall. But it is difficult, when we invoke the spirit that 'never faileth,' to fix our faith in this opinion. We are compelled to infer that the Alabama [illegible] spective action of a National Convention, where the lords of the lash, who have thus been propitiated, have always ruled the ascendant, and sometimes made very unfit nominations. If, however, they should, in 1852, take the bid now offered, they will have amply repaired their late error; for there is no man more fit to be President of a slaveholding nation than he who, possessing talents fitting him to be the most powerful champion of Liberty, strikes a barb into her heart, that he may obtain the reward of treachery.

Melancholy indeed is the spectacle now presented to the gaze of the lovers of freedom, when they behold the man of gigantic intellect, who, they had hoped, would come forth panoplied to do battle in her behalf, bowing his mighty crest before the relentless foes of human rights. If there is one more downward step necessary to secure the desired object, if there yet remains one more degrading sacrifice to be made, make it; for he that is already so low, need not fear to descend still lower, and find beneath this deepest depth a lower deep. And you cannot rise, sir, you cannot rise in the estimation of mankind, even by a faultless future life; to entitle you to the return of public confidence would be work for eternity. The eight hundred willing slaves of Mammon, who have given the sanction of their names to your weakness and depravity, will not be found to express the sentiments of Massachusetts, nor of the millions of freemen who are to have a voice in the award to be rendered as your compensation.

For twenty years past, there has been no man whose efforts could have accomplished so much, had they been exerted in behalf of freedom; but during all that period, in the Senate, in this behalf, you have been dumb. When Mr. Adams was battling with the hosts of slavery for the rights, not of slaves, but of freemen, among whom were his and your constituents, none were so competent to have strengthened his efforts than yourself, had you chosen to speak; but you were dumb. When Mr. Leigh, of Virginia, uttered in his place, in your hearing, the atrocious opinion, that the laborer ought to be the property of the capitalist, and that if slavery continued at the South, this result must obtain at the North, and appealed to Northern Senators, saying, 'Let not gentlemen of the North start at this,' you uttered no rebuke—you were dumb. But for all these sins of omission, the people have been disposed to be lenient, and have believed the 'still, small voice' of profession, uttered at popular gatherings in New England, and still fondly hoped, that in the great struggle now pending, when *compelled* to speak, the long imprisoned spirit of liberty would utter itself in your voice. This opportunity was yours, and you wickedly and basely cast it away.

Hear this from no unmoved heart,
With grief comparing what thou art,
With what thou mightst have been.

When, Prometheus-like, humanity shall, through your aid, be bound to the rock of the Union, that the vulture of Slavery may prey upon its vitals through an indefinite perpetuity of years, and this land shall no longer be claimed, even in the present partial sense, as the refuge of the brave who *would* be free, the votaries of Liberty shall point mournfully to the sad spectacle, and say—'Daniel Webster did it.'

Yours, &c., D. S. G.

TO HON. DANIEL WEBSTER.

A TESTIMONY.

WEST HARWICH, March 31st, 1850.

FRIEND GARRISON:

I have a desire to speak a few words, through your trumpet, in regard to slaveholders, Daniel Webster, and the Constitution. I am not in favor of long speeches or long prayers. The slaveholders of the South are hell-makers. They have made a hell, and I am told they have got about three millions of bodies and souls of men, women and children in their hell; and if any of them should make their escape from it, the 'godlike' of Massachusetts, Daniel Webster, promises before God and the holy Evangelists, that he will act as a bloodhound to hunt them down, and return them back to that Southern hell. I think Massachusetts would do well to put two more legs on Daniel, and sell him to the slaveholders to catch fugitive slaves. I think he would answer them a very good purpose. The time is come that the Man of Sin should be revealed; and all righteous men shall see that the wisdom of this world is foolishness. It seems to me that justice requires that Daniel Webster be put in the Southern hell for life. If any man on earth deserves such a doom, he does. When any one swears to support the American Constitution, which is a covenant with thieves and robbers, instead of swearing in the presence of God and the holy Evangelists, he should swear in presence of the devil and his wicked angels, and then kiss the covenant. We read, in olden times, of one nation that worshipped Bell and the Dragon. The American Church and nation worship devils. I know this is truth, although harshly spoken; and I hold myself alone responsible for it. I am a friend to truth and righteousness. You will please publish the above lines, weak and simple as they are. I believe it is God's will that they should be published.

SAMUEL SMITH.

WEBSTER AND SLAVE CATCHING.

RANDOLPH, Vt., April 14, 1850.

FRIEND GARRISON:

I have read the last number of the Liberator with great interest, and have been somewhat amused with the state of the public mind on the question of slavery.

Fowler has eulogized Webster as having a great amount of brain, and a strong, enduring mind; but it must be much like the beggar's land—the more one has, the worse he is off.

Political assassins always expect to get into power, but they often share the fate designed for others. Let the curse and mildew of slavery rest on them; let them shift hands with the poor fugitive slave, and take one draught from that hellish cup of Southern blessedness and bloodhound recreation!

If it is right to catch men and women for slavery in any case, it is right to catch those who approbate the system; hence, put the hounds on the track of Daniel; he must be fit only for slavery. He who proposes the enterprise, should first be subjected to the experiment.

Webster calls slavery right, because the Constitution sanctions it. By this rule, piracy, cannibalism, and every form of persecution and torture committed by nations, is to be justified. This poor, purblind office-hunter is yet to learn the first lesson of human [illegible]

But, can it be true that [illegible] common sense, in the most democratic government on earth, representing the most refined people in the world, and from a State where anti-slavery influence is more powerful than is known among any other people, that your representative has turned from Freedom's temple to the base drudgery of slave-catching!

He who would enslave one human being under some circumstances, can easily make some base apology for any kind and degree of crime.

If your Constitution is to make me a slave because my complexion is nearly as dark as Daniel's, or because my parents were slaves, then I spurn your Constitution, and will be after those pirates who support it. Tell me not, ye slave-dogs, that ye have any more right to consign me to a master, than I have to compel you to match my horse, and wear a harness by his side. 'Give me liberty, or give me death.'

ANTI-CHATTEL.

From the Pennsylvania Freeman.

DEATH OF JOHN C. CALHOUN.

Calhoun is dead. He expired on Sunday morning, March 31st, in the city of Washington. By his death the nation has lost a great statesman. From an early age he has been in public life, and a variety of important offices have been conferred upon him. During his whole course, he has been a consistent man, an honest man. He was no friend to concealment or compromise. He had one single purpose in life, and he was ever true to it, never faltering or growing weary. Death found him at his post, busy in the work to which he had devoted his life. That purpose, that work, was the defence and perpetuation of American slavery. To this he gave the first powers of his mind, the ardor of his soul, and his physical energies. He has passed away from earth, leaving a name ever to be allied with the championship of human slavery. Who will mourn for him? Will the great heart of humanity, struggling for freedom and true development, bursting, one after another, the fetters of tyranny, in its strong yearnings for full deliverance, throb painfully because he is no more? Will the slave mourn a friend departed, the philanthropist weep the loss of a coadjutor? Will the sufferers of earth pray that his mantle may fall upon another? Will the blessings of those ready to perish sanctify his grave, and their

'Grateful tears, like summer rain,
Quicken the dying grass again?'

We would be just to his memory. Speak only *truth* of the dead is our motto. In his private life, we believe, he was singularly free from the vices which stain the character of many of our great men. In all his intercourse with men, he was frank and fearless. But if the life is a failure, which is without a high aim and purpose of good, what must that be, the object and end of which is to establish injustice, to strengthen wrong, to perpetuate an institution which is a continual violation of the great principles of right which God has planted deep in the heart of man?

Mr. Calhoun was the greatest statesman in the country; almost the only man in public life who had an aim above party success, and who steadily and *victoriously* pursued it. For he was eminently successful. Nullification was successful, for it brought the North to a compromise; Texas annexation was successful; and the scheme of extending slavery into the territories now free was in a fair way to the most perfect success, when Mr. Calhoun was removed. His steady purpose was to legalize and extend the most abominable despotism which the earth now harbors. If his death shall prostrate the cause of which he was the champion, who shall regret it? It is well enough for the associates of Mr. Calhoun to eulogize their friend, and weep for his loss; but the interests of the human race are of more consequence than the preservation of private friendships; and humanity and civilization cannot suffer from the death of their great enemy.—*Lowell American.*

We would not say a word to disturb the current of public sorrow. We would always speak decently and respectfully of the dead, if possible. We don't believe that Mr. Calhoun was the worst man in the world—but we do believe that his whole life, and principles, and habits, are an exhibition of the most undisguised and unmitigated tyranny that ever did exist. He was most devotedly at antipodes with all that is known as Christianity. His religion and policy were a type of the barbarism and heathenism of ages gone by. We mourn that it was so. He loved not the poor, nor did the poor love him. The only blessings that he proposed for them were whips, and chains, and perpetual slavery. They will not call him blessed. They will rejoice in his funeral, and feel as if their emancipation is nearer than before. —*Liberty Party Paper.*

From the Boston Atlas.

SOUND THE ALARM!

He must be a very superficial observer of the progress of things in Washington, who fails to perceive the direct tendencies which are at work in that city, to make the Northern free States of this Union succumb to the imperious dictation of the South. We have always carefully avoided any approximation to a mere sectional issue in the politics of this country. We have avoided such an issue, because we feared its disastrous effect upon the peace and happiness of this Union. The North, though bated and badgered for years by the pro-slavery men of the South, have put off the evil day. They have hoped for the return of better times, and the dawn of an era of more noble and generous feelings. They have hesitated to drive points to extremes. They quietly submitted to the annexation of Texas, and the triumph which Slavery acquired in that struggle. They passively tolerated the war with Mexico, in the vain hope that the South, satisfied with its Texan acquisition, would permit the ordinance of '87 to be extended over the free territories which might be acquired by us.

This moderation on the part of the North has been met with menace and insult from the South; and now we are daily entertained with threats of a dissolution of the Union, if we remain firm to the principles of freedom; and, as usual, if we are to give credit to the information which reaches us by mail and telegraph, the North is about to cave in, and to let the South have all its own way. For our part, we feel mortified and chagrined. We have hoped for better things. We had been led to believe that the champions of freedom, entrenched and fortified as they are in a righteous cause, would prevail. But we fear that there is a want of nerve,—that there exists a faint-heartedness, an unmanly cowardice, which, in the end, will be fatal to success. We tell the people of New England, and of the North, that, unless they arouse from this lethargy, they are defeated; and slavery will obtain, in perpetual bond, the territory of New Mexico,—and, in getting that, will, in the end, involve us in future wars with Mexico, until at last that Republic shall be merged in our own, and slavery be the triumphant and ruling power of the nation. We see it as clear as the noonday. This is the real struggle, and this is the day in which is to be decided which shall rule in the American Republic, FREEDOM OR SLAVERY.

Thus impressed, we cannot hold back: we must sound the alarm. Recent events connected with our State [illegible] policy, have tended to palsy the arm of the Free State representatives. The Southern men and the Southern press taunt them daily with the fact, that even Massachusetts is opposed to the Ordinance of '87, and that it shall not pass. Would that we had the power of the prophet of old, and could animate the dry bones of our Northern valleys, and cause them to speak the glowing words of truth and freedom!

IF WE ARE BEATEN NOW, WE ARE BEATEN FOREVER. This is the turning point of our history, which is to decide whether in the hereafter the Free States or the Slave Power is to dictate the policy of America. THERE IS NO DOUBT ABOUT IT; there is no use to blink it from sight. It is so, and had it not been for a few errors of Northern leaders on the one side, and an insane ambition on the other, we should have carried the day. We hope we shall yet. If we succeed in the struggle now on hand, we have California admitted into the Union, and the policy settled that will make New Mexico and the territories free; then Northern Policy will be uppermost, and the South will be forced to pay some deference, at least, to Northern sentiment.

THE WEBSTER TESTIMONIAL.

The New Bedford Mercury talks bravely—especially for a Whig journal. Listen:

Eight hundred highly respectable Bostonians have thanked Mr. Webster for his recent speech in an address which we have already laid before our readers. Those gentlemen are very grateful for being '*recalled*' to their 'duties' under the Constitution, and we much lament that they ever wandered from those duties. Now that they have been regularly admonished, it is to be hoped that they will behave themselves better, and need no more to be 'recalled.' Eight hundred highly respectable Bostonians are very grateful to Mr. Webster for teaching them the great constitutional duty of hunting down runaway slaves, of abandoning the Wilmot Proviso, of admitting new slave States, and of doing divers other constitutional disagreeable things. With all humility, they bow before the mighty genius of Mr. Webster, and in courtly phrases give thanks. We have nothing to say against this proceeding, but we trust the eight hundred highly respectable Bostonians intend to sustain Mr. Webster triumphantly at the polls.

The managers of this important business, indeed appear to be sufficiently confident to indulge in the outset in insolence and arrogance. They were so overwhelmed with a realizing sense of their own strength and importance that they did not condescend to send their testimonial or address to the Boston Atlas for publication. They thought they could afford to slight that able and steadfast organ of the Whig party, and accordingly they magnanimously ignored its existence. We hope they can afford it; of course they have calculated their ability to be exclusive and proscriptive, and find it will pay to follow that course.

The Boston Atlas occupies a proud position. Respecting Mr. Webster as highly as any of the signers of the address respect him, it refuses to follow him blindly wheresoever he may see fit to lead. It has an opinion of its own, which it has frequently expressed, and it will not stoop to stultify itself, or eat its own words. Recognizing the unequalled ability of Mr. Webster, the Atlas will not surrender its own independence to a superior mind, nor merge its identity and individuality in any man, though he speak with the tongue of angels. Calmly and temperately, but firmly and deliberately, the Atlas dissents from Mr. Webster, and maintains its integrity, notwithstanding eight hundred respectable gentlemen of Boston send in their adhesion to the extraordinary doctrines put forth by our great Senator. If this Webster party choose to open their campaign by slighting the most influential and efficient Whig paper in the Commonwealth, we must believe that they act unadvisedly. We tell those gentlemen that no man who avows the opinions put forth by Mr. Webster in his last speech can go before the Whigs of Massachusetts at the ballot-box, with the remotest chance of success. We tell them that no man holding those views can obtain a Whig nomination for Governor, or, out of Boston, for Congress. The Whigs *mean* free soil, and the eight hundred respectables will find it out about election time. We trust they will not feel constrained to abandon the party because they are in a minority; but assuredly they will find that they do not reflect the Whig sentiment of this Commonwealth, nor do we believe that a majority of the Whigs of Boston concur with them. That Mr. Webster may carry Congress with him is not improbable, but he cannot carry with him the Whigs of his own State. The men who endorse Mr. Webster are the same whose *suspected* sentiments contributed largely to build up the Free Soil organization. The *avowal* of those sentiments will not drive more Whigs into a foreign organization, but will cement the old Whig party more strongly together. If another faction is to be formed, it must be composed of exclusive Webster men. They cannot impose their authority on the Whig party, and thus drive off another crowd of Whigs. The Whigs will overrule and outvote them overwhelmingly, and if there is to be another schism, the eight hundred respectable gentlemen must fly off from the bulk of the party, and set up business on their own account.—We await the course of events with entire confidence.

MORE WHIG TESTIMONY.

☞ Gov. Anthony, whom the Whigs of Rhode Island have just elected chief magistrate of that State, thus speaks of the relative positions of Clay, Webster and Benton before the country, in the Providence Journal, of which he is editor and proprietor:—

'We never expected to find ourselves against Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, and with Thomas H. Benton. We are not sure that we are now, but if we rightly comprehend the reports from Washington, Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster have agreed to complicate the question of the admission of California, by connecting it with that of the organization of the territories, and Mr. Benton contends for the admission of California on its own merits, and as the right of a sovereign State. We are very reluctant to say, that when Clay and Webster unite, and Benton opposes them, that the former are wrong and the latter is right; and perhaps we are mistaken, or perhaps we misapprehend their relative position, but of this we entertain no doubt: California has a right to admission, and it is unfair to connect that question with any other which will hamper and jeopard it. Men, after all, are but light-houses, shining over the head lands; principles are the eternal laws of Heaven, and the humblest mariner may take his observation from them, and be certain of his true position.'

From the Essex County Freeman.

NOT APPROVED BY THE PEOPLE.

MR. EDITOR—It strikes me that the letter of approval to Daniel Webster, from the Honorables, Reverends and Esquires, for his wicked betrayal of Liberty and Justice, adds nothing to his glory. Is it the voice of *the people*? No! Have the farmers and mechanics called a meeting? the men who shove the plane—the men who hold the plough—the men who put the spade into the earth—the men who drive the pegs—the men that draw the waxed ends—the men that tan the hides—the men that carry the leather—the men that pile up the granite in our cities—the men that make the bricks—the men that plough [illegible] and passed resolutions, in favor of his (Webster's) course? I answer again, no—and never will.

There is an eloquence that comes with the approval of the unsophisticated men and women of old New England, that Daniel Webster can *never* have, although he *may* seek for it 'carefully and with tears.' 'Slavery is no violation'—some of the signers) say 'church.' Now I ask if the approval of such [illegible] those who associate with them, is any evidence that Daniel Webster has pursued a right path, or acted in favor of freedom? I say no! it is pretty good evidence that he has been, is now, and will be a traitor to Liberty and Humanity. Should slavery spread its blighting curse over all our land, these very men who have signed this letter to Webster, would be the masters and enslavers. Is it the language of a *true* minister of Jesus, that slavery is no violation of Christian faith or the church? It seems to me that it cannot be, nor the language of a *true* statesman, that the hard hands of the North should turn bloodhounds to hunt back to chains and slavery the poor runaway slave who comes to us for succor.

JUSTICE.

Danvers, New Mills, April 14, 1850.

Correspondence of the N. Y. Post.

WASHINGTON, April 13, 1850.

Where Mr. Webster is going to, seems as questionable as on the day when he so pathetically made the same inquiry in his own proper person, in Faneuil Hall, seven or eight years ago. After facing every point of the compass at the bidding of his new Southern patrons—after being for and against Foote's compromise committee, and for and against the separate consideration of California, three or four several and distinct times—after voting for the committee and the reference of the California question to it, late on Thursday afternoon, yesterday he came out with an humble prayer and confession, addressed to his new keepers, and gave them to understand that, if they pleased, he would

'—— proceed no further in this business.'

It was at once amusing and lamentable to witness the discipline to which this distinguished and able pupil of the propaganda was subjected on Thursday. After he had given his first vote against laying the omnibus committee project on the table, he gave unmistakable signs of trepidation, and of reluctance to go on; so when the question came on referring California to this packed jury, Mr. Webster sat mute and motionless as Niobe, with her slain progeny around her. His name had been called twice, still no voice. The crisis was imminent. Mr. Badger sat on one side, Mangum on the other, Morton before, and Foote behind.

The quartette precipitated themselves on the panting and noble quarry; Badger put his hand on his coat collar, and bent over towards him; Mangum drew himself up, and looked very red in the face; Foote approached from the rear, and implored him, in the style of Sir Lucius O'Trigger, not to let his courage ooze out at the palms of his hand; Morton whispered, after the manner of Macbeth's wife, 'Are you a man?' Thus badgered and baited, Mr. Webster, the Jupiter Ammon, as some think, or say, of the Senate, gave the required monosyllable, 'no,' not to Morton's question, but to Douglass's motion to lay on the table. This is what he did on Thursday; I have not noticed what he said on Friday; nor gods nor men can tell what he may say or do on Monday. As Cuddie Headrigg would have said—'The puir boddie seems to have gone clean daft.'

From the N. Y. Evening Post.

DICKINSON AND WEBSTER.

Mr. Dickinson, of this State, we perceive makes one of the accomplices of Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster in this scheme, and votes with them in favor of remanding California to a committee. A just claim, a meritorious application, a measure which, if it could be put to a naked vote on its own merits, would have a large majority in the Senate, is postponed, is kept from being discussed, is withheld from being brought to a vote, is endangered, is prejudiced in the public opinion, by connecting it with measures to which it has no more natural relation, than the theory of gravitation has to the annual appropriation bills.

From Senator Dickinson, however, we expected nothing better; he has always been the declared enemy of freedom in the territories, always in favor

of opening them to slave emigration, to the virtual exclusion of the free laborer. We did not expect to see him, as Mr. Bradbury has done, yielding an honest and manly obedience to the instructions of his constituents, in regard to the immediate admission of California and the exclusion of slavery from the territories; we expected, from his peculiar character, all sorts of skulking evasions of his instructions, if not a direct violation of them. A bold and open declaration that he did not regard them, and will not be bound by them, would do him infinitely more honor than the course he is pursuing.

For Mr. Dickinson's associate in this affair, Mr. Webster, who misrepresents Massachusetts as palpably as Mr. Dickinson misrepresents New York, we perceive that the public charity is implored. When an unfortunate man loses all his property by fire, benevolent persons get up a subscription for his benefit. They draw up a paper expressing their sympathy, they set down their names, they part with a little of their own substance that they may contribute something to his.

When a politician loses his reputation by a sudden and suspicious change of opinion, the same course is sometimes pursued. Charitable persons get up a paper, declare their cordial sympathy with the unfortunate person, and part with a little of their own reputation in order to make him a new one. This process has been tried in Boston, as we mentioned the other day, by Mr. Webster's friends, but the relief obtained in this way was not found sufficient for the purpose. Only eight hundred persons out of the twenty thousand voters of that city, signed the subscription to furnish out a new reputation for Mr. Webster, and a second subscription has been started in this city. We have a large class of respectable people, respectable as the world goes, who sign any paper that is presented to them. Among these, it will be a hard case if Mr. Webster cannot get a few thousand names.

WASHINGTON DISHONORED.

Mr. Webster resorts to the old trick of quoting the authority of Washington to enforce the doctrines of quietism which he lays down. This is doing rank injustice to the name and fame of the Father of his Country. No one can for a moment belive that the illustrious Washington would have counselled concession and compromise, knowing the extension of human slavery to be the sure fruits of such a policy. He never sought for rest, quietness and peace at the expense of freedom. He did, to be sure, urge sacrifices to maintain the Union of these States, because he believed the purpose of the Union to be the security and extension of liberty. So long as the government of the Union is confined to such a purpose, peace and harmony may well be urged; but when it is sought by the slave power to subvert the government of the Union from its original intention, and to turn it into a means for the extension and perpetuity of bondage, quietness and submission and concession can no longer be urged with propriety. No one hardly can doubt that were Washington now living, he would be found amongst those most strenuous in opposition to the slave power. All his sympathies and opinions would lead him to join with those who resist the designs of the slaveholders to usurp entire control of the national government, and dictate henceforth our national policy. It was Washington, let it be remembered, who declared that if slavery could be abolished, 'his suffrage should not be wanting.' What an outrage it is that the language of one who stood by the cause of infant Liberty in her weakest and darkest hour, should be quoted to justify the treachery of the man who has gone over to the enemy at the height of the contest, when the battle seemed turning against the hosts of slavery.—*Essex County Freeman.*

From the Manchester (Eng.) Times, of March 27th.

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

On Thursday evening last, a numerous assemblage of ladies and gentlemen took place at the Temperance Hall, Little Bolton, upon which occasion an interesting address was delivered by Mr. Wm. Wells Brown, an American fugitive slave, and delegate from Boston at the Peace Congress held in Paris. On Friday evening, a tea-party was held, at which about 200 ladies and gentlemen were present, including George Thompson, Esq., M. P., the Rev. Mr. Etheridge, Rev. Mr. Crossley, Councillors Stockdale and Richardson, E. Ashworth, Esq., &c. After tea, other parties were admitted, and, upon the whole, there was a tolerably numerous gathering. Geo. Thompson, Esq., opened the proceedings by stating that he had to depart elsewhere [illegible] could not go away without a few words in honor of one whom he considered to be the champion of his race. He had remarked, on the previous evening, that mighty issues were evolved at times from small beginnings, and of this the attempt to abolish slavery afforded an example: for if Cambridge a prize was 1785, the[illegible] best essay in the Latin language on offered[illegible]. The Rev. Thomas Clarkson was a competitor, and procured all the works that he could upon the horrors and atrocities of the African slave trade; on examination, he found it was one of the most flagrant crimes. He finished his essay, and won the prize, but his philanthropy did not stop there, for he translated it into English, and took a journey to London. On his arrival there, he met with Mr. Phillips, a Quaker, who undertook to publish the essay; Dilwin also became a friend. He used to meet these and other friends whilst pursuing the study of the law at the Temple. This was the commencement of the agitation, afterwards followed up by clergymen in Yorkshire, and first introduced to the notice of parliament by Mr. Wilberforce. Mr. Thompson then alluded to the declaration of independence in America, and the idea that then prevailed that with it the slave trade would be abolished in that part of the globe—indeed, slaves were *ipso facto* declared to be free, but the Southern States resisted their emancipation, and a compromise congress prevented the passing of a law. Nowithstanding this, the question had been kept alive by the Society of Friends, and doubtless would terminate in the abolition of such a monstrous and inhuman traffic. After some further remarks, he apologised for being obliged to withdraw, and was warmly applauded. At eight o'clock, Mr. Etheridge introduced Mr. Brown, a very interesting man, but not of deep color, who related a variety of incidents of travel, and the manner the slaves are treated, with the horrors of punishment, separation of families, &c. These interesting details are worthy the perusal of all who seek for the redemption and emancipation of their fellow-creatures, and will be found in a narrative recently published by Mr. Brown. Mr. H. M. Richardson then rose to present to Mr. Brown an address from the ladies of Bolton, stating that he had not anticipated such a delightful task, the more pleasant as it was accompanied by a purse containing £12, which they wished to tender as a slight testimony of their esteem, and in consideration of the expense he must have to bear in such an honorable mission. After some further appropriate remarks, he read the address, which was as follows:—

An address presented to Mr. William Wells Brown, the fugitive slave from America, by the ladies of Bolton, March 22nd, 1850:—

Dear Friend and Brother,—We cannot permit you to depart from among us, without giving expression to the feelings which we entertain towards yourself personally, and to the sympathy which you have awakened in our breasts for the three millions of our sisters and brothers who still suffer and groan in the prison house of American bondage. You came among us an entire stranger; we received you for the sake of your mission; and having heard the story of your personal wrongs, and gazed with horror on the atrocities of slavery as seen through the medium of your touching descriptions, we are resolved henceforward, in reliance on divine assistance, to render what aid we can to the cause which you have so eloquently pleaded in our presence.

We have no words to express our detestation of the crimes which, in the name of liberty, are committed in the country which gave you birth; language fails to tell our deep abhorrence of the impiety of those who, in the still more sacred name of religion, rob immortal beings not only of an earthly citizenship, but do much to prevent them from obtaining a heavenly one; and as mothers and daughters, we embrace this opportunity of giving utterance to our utmost indignation at the cruelties perpetrated upon our sex by a people professedly acknowledging the equality of all mankind. Carry with you, on your return to the land of your nativity, this our solemn protest against the wicked institution, which, like a dark and baleful cloud, hangs over it; and ask the unfeeling enslavers, as best you can, to open the prison doors to them that are bound, and let the oppressed go free.

Allow us to assure you that your brief sojourn in our town has been to ourselves, and to vast multitudes, of a character long to be remembered; and when you are far removed from us, and toiling, as we hope you may be long spared to do, in this righteous enterprize, it may be some solace to your mind to [illegible] that your name is cherished with affectionate regard, and that the blessing of the Most High is earnestly supplicated in behalf of yourself, your family, and the cause to which you have consecrated your distinguished talents.

Mr. Brown received the compliment amidst much cheering, and returned thanks in a feeling manner.

Rev. Mr. Crossley then moved:—'That this meeting hereby records its thorough detestation of slavery wherever it exists, and cordially congratulates Mr. William Wells Brown on his escape therefrom: and also expresses its hearty sympathy with his effortsi and the efforts of all those who are laboring for the freedom of the American slaves, and earnestly wishes them 'God speed.''

Mr. Ormrod seconded the motion, and it was carried unanimously. After thanks to the ladies for their services at the tea tables, the proceedings terminated.

OUTRAGE IN THE U. S. SENATE—PISTOL DRAWN BY MR. FOOTE!

A scene took place in the Senate of the United States, on Monday (15th inst.,) which should put the country to the blush. After an altercation in regard to Mr. Foote's committee, Mr. Benton crossed the floor, advancing on Mr. Foote, but whether with a hostile intent or not, does not appear, when Mr. Foote drew a pistol, concealed on his person, which he presented at Mr. Benton! The members, surrounding the belligerents, promptly interfered, and prevented bloodshed, although the Senate were thrown into a state of confusion, which at one time seemed to threaten a general melee. In this most disgraceful affair, Foote is clearly the guilty party, and should, without delay, be expelled from his seat. He has the spirit of a bully and an assassin, though without doubt, he is a contemptible poltroon, and notwithstanding his vaporing in debate, would be quite likely to run, if his person was in danger. If the Committee raised to investigate this outrage should, as is most likely, merely whitewash the affair, and the Senate pass over the matter with a mild rebuke, we see not why the insulted community should not petition for the expulsion of Foote, and thus show their indignation against such indecent outrages and the abettors of them.—*Plymouth Memorial.*

MR. FOOTE'S SELECT COMMITTEE.

IN SENATE, WASHINGTON, Thursday, April 18.

The Committee of Investigation into the disorder of yesterday, was announced as follows:—Mr. Dodge of Wisconsin, Webster, King, Phelps, Rusk, Bell, and Shields. Mr. Dodge asked to be excused, because of the peculiar relations existing between him and Mr. Benton.

Mr. Foote said that as far as he was concerned, he would prefer the Senator as a member of the Committee, to any man in America.

Mr. Dodge thanked Mr. Foote for this expression of kind feelings, but said it was a matter personal with himself, and that, from delicacy of feeling on the subject, he must insist upon being excused. The vote being taken, he was excused.

Senators Shields and Rusk made similar requests, which were refused.

After the transaction of the morning's business, Mr. Benton moved to postpone all prior orders for the purpose of taking up the bill for the admission of California as a State. After a discussion upon questions of order, the Vice-President ruled that a motion to postpone could not be made until the subject proposed to be postponed had first been taken up. Mr. Benton then moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the California bill.

Mr. Clay moved to lay the motion on the table, which was agreed to. Yeas 27, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Borland, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clemens, Davis, (of Miss.,) Dickinson, Downs, Foote, Hunter, King, Mangum, Mason, Martin, Pierce, Rusk, Sebastian, Sewell, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Whitcomb, and Yulee.

NAYS—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Chase, Clark, Corwin, Davis, (of Mass.,) Dayton, Dodge, (of Wis.,) Dodge, (of Iowa,) Douglass, Fitch, Green, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Miller, Morris, Phelps, Seward, Shields, Spruance, Walker, and Webster.

The Senate then resumed the consideration of the unfinished business of yesterday.

Mr. Foote having the floor, said that in view of the exigencies of the case he would refrain from any further remarks, and simply ask the Senate to come to a speedy vote.

Mr. Mangum expressed the hope that the Senate would vote *seriatim* on all of Mr. Benton's propositions [illegible] debate by the majority, or any attempt to restrict debate by the minority.

Mr. Clay expressed his hearty concurrence in what had just been said, and united in the hope that the majority would relieve itself from the responsibility of further protraction and delay.

The question was then stated upon Mr. Benton's amendment, instructing the committee not to connect California with any other measure.

Messrs. Butler and Borland said they should vote against the propositions, on the ground that they were palpable contradictions of what the Senate did yesterday. Other Senators also declared their reasons for votes which they would give, so that the votes could not be considered a test.

The amendment was rejected. Yeas 25, nays 26. The question was thus taken by yeas and nays, upon each of Mr. Benton's nine propositions.

The question was then taken upon the following amendments proposed by Mr. Benton, all of which were rejected.

Resolved, That nothing in the instructions shall be construed to authorize the said committee to take into consideration anything that relates to either of the four following subjects:—

1st. The abolition of Slavery within the States.

2d. The suppression of the slave-trade between the States.

3d. The Abolition of Slavery within the Forts, Arsenals, Dock Yards, and Navy grounds of the United States.

4th. The Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

And Provided further, That said Committee shall not take into consideration any questions relating to the subject of Domestic slavery in the United States, which shall not be speedily referred to it by order of the Senate.

The question was then taken upon a proposition of Mr. Hamlin, excepting the admission of California from the reference, which was rejected by yeas 20, nays 25.

Mr. Walker moved to amend the original motion of reference, by excepting therefrom the subject of the arrest of fugitive slaves, which was rejected, yeas 17, nays 20.

Mr. Hale moved to amend by adding a provision, referring to the committee all the petitions and remonstrances sent to the Senate this session, relating to the subjects referred to the select committee.

Mr. Clay hoped the reference would be made. He thought the committee, after reading one or two of them, would be satisfied.

Mr. King opposed the reference of these petitions from miserable fanatics. It was insulting to propose it.

Mr. Hale, in the course of some remarks in reply, said that the Senator from Alabama considered it respectful to refer the cogitations of the Senate, but when it was proposed to refer the thoughts of the people—of the sovereigns—he called it insulting.

Mr. Clemens said he had received a petition from New York, which he should present to-morrow, suggesting the necessity for the establishment of a lunatic asylum for the abolition members, and referring to the case of an individual Senator, asking that his head be shaved forthwith, and that he be put upon a cold water diet. (Laughter.)

After debate, the Chair ruled Mr. Hale's amendment out of order, upon the ground that the propositions to be referred were not under consideration.

The final question being then taken upon the motion to refer Clay and Bell's resolutions to a select committee of 13 without instructions, it was *adopted*, yeas 30, nays 22, as follows:—

YEAS—Atchison, Badger, Bell, Borland, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Davis, (Miss.,) Dickinson, Dodge, (Iowa,) Downs, Foote, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turner, Underwood, Whitcomb, Yulee.

NAYS—Baldwin, Benton, Bradbury, Chase, Clarke, Corwin, Davis, (Mass.,) Dayton, Dodge, (Wis.) Douglas, Felch, Green, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Morris, Phelps, Seward, Shields, Smith, Walker, Webster.

On motion by Mr. Mangum, it was ordered that the Senate ballot first for the Chairman of the Committee. On motion by Mr. Davis, (Miss.,) the balloting was postponed until to-morrow.

Mr. Hale then moved that all the petitions and remonstrances lying on the table relating to the subjects just referred to the select committee, be referred to said committee.

Mr. Clay moved an adjournment, but withdrew the motion for Mr. Douglas, who expressed a hope that the Senate would now, in accordance with the pledge given yesterday by Mr. Clay, take the California bill, and make it the special order for to-morrow.

Messrs. Butler and Mangum insisted upon an adjournment, and the Senate adjourned.

WASHINGTON, April 19.

Mr. Seward moved a correction of the journal, in which he had been recorded as voting in the affirmative upon Mr. Benton's proposition of refusing to refer to the Select Committee the question of the internal slave trade. He had voted in the negative.

After the presentation of petitions, Mr. Douglas moved that the California bill be taken up, which was agreed to.

Mr. Douglas moved that the bill be made the special order for to-day, immediately after the appointment of the Select Committee.

Mr. Turney moved to refer the bill to the Select Committee.

The question of postponement taking priority, was put, and agreed to.

The Senate then proceeded to ballot for the Chairman of the Select Committee upon the compromise resolutions of Mr. Bell and Mr. Clay. On the first ballot, Mr. Clay had 28 votes, Bell 1, Benton 1, Mangum 1, blank 4.

So Mr. Clay was declared elected.

Messrs. Cass, Dickinson, Bright, Webster, Phelps, Cooper, King, Macon, Downs, Mangum, Bell, and Berrian were, on the next ballot, elected the remaining members of the Committee without opposition.

Mr. Phelps asked to be excused, particularly on account of his health.

Mr. Mangum appealed to Mr. Phelps to withdraw his application. The sittings of the Committee could be so arranged as to put the Senator to no serious inconvenience.

Mr. Phelps said he had other objections. He must say that he had felt from the outset that the appointment of the Committee would result in nothing but an expression of opinion, and that in that view he would, if placed upon the Committee, be compelled to throw himself entirely on his own personal views. The probability in his mind was, that the result of the whole proceeding would be unsatisfactory to the Senate and the country.

Mr. Webster hoped Mr. Phelps would not insist. If the example was to be set of excusing, because of the fear that the Committee would arrive at no practicable result, he should perhaps feel compelled to follow it.

Mr. Phelps could not withdraw his application, but if the Senate refused to excuse him, he must make the best of his situation.

The question being taken, Mr. Phelps was not excused.

[It will be observed that the opponents of the Committee generally failed to vote at all upon its appointment.]

Mr. Benton moved that the Select Committee be instructed to report separately, on each of the subjects referred to it, and not to join two or more subjects, not of the same character, in one bill.

Mr. Badger objected to the consideration, and the motion lies over under the rule.

Mr. Douglas called for the special order, and the California State bill was taken up. After some conversation with reference to the absence of the Committee to convey Mr. Calhoun's remains to South Carolina, a motion to postpone the further consideration of the California bill to next Monday two weeks, was agreed to.

Mr. Butler expressed his surprise that it had been assumed that the subject of the admission of California could be taken up and discussed after the subject had been referred to the Select Committee, and before that Committee should report.

Mr. Clay said Mr. Butler was much mistaken, if he supposed the California bill could be acted on without a struggle, and he hoped a successful struggle, to engraft upon it the territorial bills. He had in his hand amendments to that effect, which he designed proposing.

Mr. Benton gave notice, that when Mr. Clay submitted his amendments, he had in his hand parliamentary law, (holding up four quarto volumes,) to show that the Senator from Kentucky proposed a course in violation of all parliamentary practice and law.

Mr. Clay expressed his readiness to meet the Senator's parliamentary law.

Mr. Hale renewed the motion which he made yesterday, that the petitions, resolutions, relating to the subjects referred to the Select Committee appointed this morning, be referred to said Committee.

Mr. Atchison moved that the motion be laid on the table, which was agreed to—yeas 24, nays 23.

From the Boston Daily Advertiser.

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT.

SARAH ROBERTS *vs.* THE CITY OF BOSTON.

This was an action on the case, brought by the plaintiff, an infant, who sued by her father and next friend, against the city of Boston, under the statute of 1845, ch. 214, which provides that any child unlawfully excluded from public school instruction in this Commonwealth, shall recover damages therefor against the city or town by which such public instruction is supported.

Under the system of public schools, established in the city of Boston, primary schools are supported by the city for the instruction of all children residing therein between the ages of four and seven years. For this purpose, the city is divided for convenience, but not by geographical lines, into twenty-one districts, in each of which are several primary schools, making the whole number of primary schools in the city of Boston one hundred and sixty-one. These schools are under the immediate management and superintendence of the primary school committees, so far as that committee has authority, by virtue of the powers conferred by votes of the grammar school committee.

In 1848, the following vote of that committee was passed:—

'At a meeting of the school committee of the city of Boston, held at City Hall, on Wednesday, the 12th day of January, 1848—

The following gentlemen were nominated and appointed members of the primary school committee, viz: George Sturtevant, and one hundred and thirty-five others.

Resolved, That the primary school committee be, and they hereby are, authorized to organize their body and regulate their proceedings as they may deem most convenient; and to fill all vacancies occurring in the same, and to remove any of their members at their discretion during the ensuing year; and that this Board will cheerfully receive from said committee, such communications as they may have occasion to make.'

The city of Boston is not divided into geographical school districts; and the general school committee, by the city charter, have the care and superintendence of the public schools. In the various grammar and primary schools, white children do not always or necessarily go to schools nearest their residences; and in the case of the Latin and English High Schools, most of the children are obliged to go past school-houses nearest their residences.

The regulations of the Primary School Committee contain the following provisions:—

'ADMISSIONS. No pupil shall be admitted into a primary school without a ticket of admission from a member of the District Committee.

ADMISSIONS OF APPLICANTS. Every member of the Committe shall admit to his school all applicants of suitable age and qualifications, residing nearest to the school under his charge, (excepting those for whom special provision has been made,) provided the number in his school will warrant the admission.'

'SCHOLARS TO GO TO THE SCHOOL NEAREST THEIR RESIDENCES. Applicants for admission to our schools (with the exception and provision referred to in the preceding rule) are especially entitled to enter the schools nearest their places of residence.'

The city of Boston, at the time of the plaintiff's application for admission to the primary school, had established, for the exclusive use of colored children, two primary schools, one in Belknap-street, in the eighth school district, and one in Sun Court-st., in the second school district.

The colored population of Boston constituted less than one sixty-second part of the entire population of the city. For half a century, separate schools have been kept in Boston for colored children, and the primary school for colored children in Belknap-street was established in 1840, and has been kept there ever since. The teachers of this school have the same compensation and qualifications as in the other like schools in the city. Colored schools were originally established by the request of the colored citizens, whose children could not attend the public schools on account of the prejudice then existing against them.

The plaintiff is a colored child, of five years of age, a resident of Boston, and living with her father since the month of March, 1847, in Andover-street, in the Sixth Primary School District. In the month of April, 1847, she being of suitable age and qualifications, (unless her color was a disqualification,) applied to a member of the District Primary School Committee having under his charge the primary school nearest to her place of residence, for a ticket of admission to said school, the number in said school warranting her admission; and no special provision having been made for her, unless the establishment of said two schools, for colored children exclusively, is to be so considered.

The said member of the School Committee refused the application, on the grounds of her being a colored person, and of the special provision made as aforesaid. The plaintiff thereupon applied to the Primary School Committee of the District for admission to one of their schools, and was in like manner refused admission, on the ground of her color, and the provision aforesaid. She thereupon petitioned the general Primary School Committee for leave to enter one of the schools nearest her residence. That Committee referred the subject to the Committee of the District, with full powers, and the said Committee of the District thereupon again refused the plaintiff's application, on the ground aforesaid, and the plaintiff has not attended any school in Boston. Afterwards, on the 15th day of February, 1848, the plaintiff went into the primary school nearest her residence, but without any ticket of admission or other leave granted, and was on that day ejected from said school by the teacher.

The school established in Belknap-street is twenty-one hundred feet distant from the residence of the plaintiff, measuring through the streets; and in passing from the plaintiff's residence to Belknap-street school, the direct road passes the ends of two streets in which there are five primary schools. The distance to the school in Sun Court-street is much greater. The distance from the plaintiff's residence to the nearest primary school is nine hundred feet. The plaintiff might have attended the school in Belknap-street, at any time, and her father was so informed, but refused so to do.

In 1846, George Putnam and other colored citizens of Boston petitioned the Primary School Committee that exclusive schools for colored children might be abolished, and the said Committee, June 22, 1846, adopted the report of a sub-commiitee, and adopted the resolution appended thereto, which was in the following words:—

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Board, the continuance of separate schools for colored children, and the regular attendance of all such children upon the schools, is not only legal and just, but is best adapted to promote the education of that class of our population.'

If, upon the foregoing statement of facts, the plaintiff is entitled to recover, the case is to be submitted to a jury to assess damages; otherwise, the plaintiff is to become non-suit. The printed rules of the general and primary School Committees of the city of Boston, and the majority and minority reports and proceedings of the primary School Committee, on the petition of George Putnam and others in 1846, and his petitions are made a part of the case so far as the same may be considered legal testimony. [The nature of these documents will be sufficiently indicated in the opinion of the Court.] The Court may draw such inferences from the facts as a jury would be authorized to draw.

Upon the above statement of acts, the Court below ordered judgment thereon for the defendants, and for their costs. The plaintiff appealed to this Court from said judgment.

The counsel for the plaintiff made the following points: (1.) According to the spirit of American institutions, and especially of the Constitution of Massachusetts, all men, without distinction of color or race, are equal before the law. (2.) The legislation of the State makes no discrimination of color or race in the establishment of the common schools. (3.) The Courts of the Commonwealth have never recognized any discrimination founded on color or race, in the administration of the common schools, but have recognized the equal rights of all the inhabitants. (4.) The exclusion of colored children from the general public schools is a source of practical inconvenience to them and to their parents, to which white persons are not exposed; and is, therefore, a violation of equality. (5.) The discrimination of children on account of color or race, is in the nature of *caste*, and a violation of equality. (6.) The [illegible] on account of color or race, and to compel them to go to separate schools, in defiance of the principle of equality. (7.) The court should declare the by-law of the school committee, making a discrimination of color or race, to be illegal or unconstitutional, although there are no words of express prohibition in the Constitution or laws.

The counsel for the city contended that the question involved in the case was one of pure law. He admitted, to the fullest extent, most of the propositions of the plaintiff's counsel, and if it was necessary to violate them, in order to gain the case, he had no desire to gain it, and he ought not to gain it. But these propositions of the plaintiff did not reach the case. The plaintiff brought this suit, alleging that she had been 'unlawfully excluded from *public school instruction*.' The case found, and it was admitted, that she might have gone to a school as good, in all respects, as any in the city. Her complaint was, that she could not have a right (denied to other children) to select her own school; that the school committee, in the fair exercise of their discretion, pointed out the particular school to which she should go, as they also did to every other child in the city. The case also found that the plaintiff was not obliged to go farther to school than many white children. The real question, after all, was one of law, namely: whether the school committee had the power—the *legal right*, to make separate schools for white, and separate schools for colored children, acting in good faith for the interests of the children themselves. Whether it was best or expedient, to exercise the power as they had done, was an entirely distinct question, with which this Court had nothing to do, provided the committee acted without malice.

Upon this point, the counsel took the following points:

1. The power was given to the School Committee by the City charter and subsequent laws.

2. That grant of power was constitutional.

3. The school committee were the exclusive judges of the best manner of executing the power given them.

Upon these various points, a general history of the school laws was given, and a large number of authorities were cited. It was admitted in the case, that these colored schools were established half a century ago, at the express and urgent request of the colored people themselves, 'who could not go to the white schools on account of the prejudice against them.' It was then regarded as a great boon. Many, if not most of the colored population, regarded them so now. The school committee had merely carried out a policy which had existed ever since, and long before the adoption of the city charter. But whether they had acted *wisely* or not, was no question for this Court. The only question here was, whether they had acted *legally*. All other considerations and most of the arguments of plaintiff's counsel were more proper to be addressed to the school committee than to the Court.

The case was argued last term. At the present term, Chief Justice SHAW delivered the opinion of the Court.

After stating the principal facts given in the above agreed statement, he said that the present case did not involve any question in regard to the legality of the Smith school, being a school of another class, designed for colored children more advanced in age and proficiency; though much of the argument affecting the legality of the separate primary schools affected, in like manner, that school. The case referred to the primary schools alone. That it appeared that the plaintiff had access to a school, set apart for colored children, in all respects as well fitted to advance education of children under seven years of age, as the other primary schools; the objection was, that the schools thus open to the plaintiff were exclusively appropriated to colored children, and were more distant from her home. That, under these circumstances, the question was, whether the plaintiff had been unlawfully excluded from public school instruction.

That the Court, upon the best consideration they had been able to give to the subject, were of the opinion that she had not.

He said that it was a question of power, of the legal authority of the committee entrusted by the city with that department of public instruction; for if they had the legal authority, the expediency of exercising it, in any particular way, was exclusively with them.

That the great principle advanced by the learned and eloquent advocate of the plaintiff was, that by the Constitution and laws of Massachusetts, all persons, without distinction of age, or sex, birth, or color, origin, or condition, were equal before the law. His Honor said that, as a broad and general principle, such as ought to appear in a declaration of rights, it was perfectly sound; that it was not only expressed in terms, but pervaded and animated the whole spirit of our free Constitution and free government.

But that when this great principle came to be applied to the actual and various conditions of human society, it would not warrant the assertion that men and women were legally clothed with the same civil and political powers, that children and adults were legally to have the same functions, and be subject to the same treatment; but that the rights of all, as they were settled and regulated by law, were equally entitled to the paternal consideration and protection of the law, for their maintenance and security. But what these rights were, to which individuals, in this infinite variety of circumstances in society were entitled, would depend upon laws adapted to their respective relations and conditions. Conceding, therefore, in the fullest manner, that colored persons, the descendants of Africans, were entitled by law, in this Commonwealth, to equal rights, constitutional and political, and civil and social, the question still remained, whether the regulations in question, which provided separate schools for colored children, were a violation of any of these rights.

That legal rights would, after all, depend upon the provisions of law; certainly all those rights of individuals which could be ascertained and maintained before a judicial tribunal. That the proper province of a declaration of rights and constitution of government, after declaring its form, regulating its organization and the distribution of its powers, was to declare great principles and fundamental truths, to influence and direct the judgment and conscience of legislators, in making laws, rather than to limit and control them, by directing what precise laws they should make. The provision, that it should be the duty of legislatures and magistrates to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, especially the university at Cambridge, public schools and grammar schools, in the towns, was purely of that character. But should the legislature fail to comply with the injunction, and neglect their duty in this respect so as to leave the education of the young to depend on private means, strong and explicit as were the terms of the Constitution, still that instrument would afford no remedy or redress to those who depended upon public schools for education.

That it was necessary, then, to resort to the law, to ascertain what were the rights of individuals in regard to schools. By the Rev. St.. c. 23, the general system was provided for. It directed what money should be raised in different towns, according to their numbers, provided for power of dividing towns into school districts, leaving it, however, at their option to divide the towns into districts, or to administer the system and provide schools without such division. That the latter course, so far as it appeared, had been constantly adopted in Boston, without forming the territory into districts.

That the statute, after directing what length of time schools should be kept, in towns of different number of inhabitants and families, provided, § 10, that the inhabitants should annually choose by ballot a school committee, who should have the general charge and superintendence of the public schools in such town. That there being no specific directions how schools should be organized, how many schools be kept, what should be the qualifications for admission to the schools, the age at which children might enter, the age to which they might continue, could all be regulated by the committee under the power of general superintendence. That there was, indeed, a provision, § 5 and 6, that towns might, and in some cases should, provide a high school and classical school, for the benefit of *all the inhabitants*. But it was obvious how this clause was introduced; that it was to distinguish such classical and high school, in towns districted from the district schools. That these schools being of a higher character, and designed for pupils of more advanced age, and greater proficiency, was intended for the benefit of the whole of the town, and not of particular districts. That still it depended upon the committee to prescribe the qualifications and make all those reasonable rules, for organizing such schools, and regulating and conducting them.

That this power of general superintendence vested authority in the committee to arrange, classify and [illegible] as they should think best adapted to their general proficiency and welfare. If it should be thought expedient to provide for very young children, it might be, that such schools should be kept exclusively by female teachers, quite adequate to their instruction, and yet whose services might be obtained at a cost much lower than those of more highly qualified male instructors. So if they should judge it expedient to have a grade of schools taking children from 7 to 10, another from 10 to 14, &c., it would seem in their authority so to do, so to separate smaller female children into different schools. That it had been found necessary, that is, highly expedient, at times, to establish special schools for poor and neglected children, who had passed the age of 14, and become too old to attend the primary schools, and yet had not the rudiments of learning to enable them to enter the ordinary schools. If such a class of youth, of one or both sexes, were found in that condition, and it would be expedient to organize them into a separate school, to receive the special training adapted to their condition, it would seem to be within the power of the superintending committee to provide for the organization of such separate school.

That perhaps somewhat more specific rules on this subject might be beneficially provided by the Legislature; but yet, that it would probably be quite impracticable to make full and precise laws on that subject, on account of different condition of wants in different towns. In towns of large territory, over which inhabitants were thinly settled, an arrangement going far into detail, providing different schools, for pupils of different ages of each sex, and then color, might require the pupils to go such distances from their homes to the schools, that it would be unreasonable. Whereas, in Boston, where far more than 100,000 inhabitants lived within a space so small, that it would be scarcely an inconvenience to require a boy of robust health, to traverse daily the whole extent of it, and therefore a system of distribution and classification might be adopted and carried into effect, which might be useful and beneficent in its influence on the character of the schools, and in its adaptation to the improvement and advancement of the great purpose of education, and at the same time practicable and reasonable in its operation. That in the absence of special legislation on this subject, the power was vested in the committee to regulate such system of distribution and classification, and when this power was reasonably exercised without being abused or perverted, by colorable pretences, the decision of the committee upon the subject should be deemed conclusive.

That the committee, apparently upon great deliberation, had come to the conclusion that the good of both classes of schools would be promoted by maintaining the separate primary schools, for colored and white children, and that the Court could perceive no ground to doubt, that this was the honest result of their judgment.

That it was argued that this maintenance of separate schools tended to deepen and perpetuate the odious distinction of *caste*, founded in a deep-rooted prejudice, in public opinion. That this prejudice, if it existed, was independent of law, and probably could not be changed by law. Whether this distinction and prejudice, existing in opinion only, could not be as effectually fostered by compelling white and colored children to associate in the same schools, might be well doubted; at all events, that it was a fair and proper question for the committee, and that the court could not say that their decision upon it was not founded upon the results of a sober and honest judgment.

That the increased distance, to which the plaintiff was obliged to go to school, from her father's house, was not, in the opinion of the court, such as to render the regulation in question unavoidable, still [illegible] illegal.

That on the whole case stated, the court [illegible] the opinion, that the action could not be ma[illegible]. The plaintiff non-suit. Messrs. CHARLES [illegible] and MORRIS for the plaintiff; Mr. P. W. [illegible] City Solicitor, for the defendant.

☞ This decision of the Court fill[illegible] with astonishment, for we regard it as unwar[illegible] constitution of our laws, and especially of [illegible] greater than Massachusetts. The people ([illegible] remedy this injustice [illegible] the Court) will, we are confi[illegible] next session. The subject shall be agitated th[illegible] out the State.

VOL. XX. NO. 17.

The Liberator.

BOSTON, APRIL 26, 1850.

No Union with Slaveholders!

SIXTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE American Anti-Slavery Society.

The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held at the *Broadway Tabernacle* on TUESDAY, the seventh of May, 1850.

At no moment since the commencement of the Anti-Slavery enterprise have the devoted zeal and earnest efforts of its advocates been more needed than at this. The American Society stands now, as it did at the beginning, the *sole enemy*, throughout all the United States, to the system of AMERICAN CHATTEL SLAVERY. The magnitude of its work, and the importance of the obstacles in the way of its accomplishment, are yearly made more and more manifest, as every party and organization that have hoped to struggle against the Slave Power, by consenting to compromise with it, successively retire from the contest, either glorying in successful treachery or submitting to shameful defeat. A contest of near twenty years has proved that the only hopeful issue with Slavery is the demand for the IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL EMANCIPATION OF EVERY SLAVE, and that such a consummation can never be attained as long as we maintain a political UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

The Northern boundary of the slave States is the same to-day that it was when the American Society came into existence; its Southern is extended westward and southward, embracing vast and fertile territories, sufficient to insure its existence for centuries to come. It is something to be thankful and hopeful for, that this extension has not been without a struggle, and that this struggle becomes daily more and more earnest and determined. It will be entirely successful when the North is awakened to the conviction that the ABOLITION OF SLAVERY will alone determine its extension—that a Southern and Western boundary will no longer be contended for when its Northern is destroyed.

The ABOLITIONISTS of the AMERICAN SOCIETY alone are devoted to this work. The annual return of the Anniversary of their organization should remind them, each and all, of the duty they have assumed, and the responsibility which they have recognized as their own. He who does the most to make its action and its voice the most efficient, will have only done the least he ought to do.

The meetings of the Society will be continued, as usual, for three days. The place of meeting will be named in future notices.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *President.*
WENDELL PHILLIPS, SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, } *Secretaries.*

LAMARTINE AND THE WORKING CLASSES OF FRANCE.

Atheism among the People. By Alphonse de Lamartine. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 110 Washington street—1850.

This is a translation of one of a series of Essays, by Lamartine, which have appeared in his monthly journal, entitled '*Le Conseiller du Peuple*'—The People's Counsellor. It is written in the usually glowing but somewhat too declamatory style of its renowned author, and has passages of great beauty and true eloquence. But we scarcely know whether it gives us more pleasure or pain—a mixture of both we have certainly felt in perusing it, but which of these preponderates, it is difficult for us at this moment to decide. That the object which Lamartine has in view is a laudable one; that the present moral and spiritual condition of France calls for great lamentation over it, and the most virtuous and heroic efforts for its regeneration; that (to borrow his own language) there has been 'a weakening of the sentiment of God in the soul of the people, from year to year, from century to century,' may be conceded. Whether this Essay is what is needed in France at the present time, is at least problematical, in our judgment, for reasons which we will state very briefly.

It seems to us that Lamartine over-estimates the importance of a formal, technical recognition of the existence of God; because such a recognition has been common to all Christendom for ages. 'To love the people,' he says, 'it is necessary to believe in God.' What kind of a God? The Autocrat of Russia, the Emperor of Austria, Haynau himself,—the Pope and his Cardinals,—the American slaveholders, slave breeders and slave traffickers,—all profess to 'believe in God.' Do they love the people? Will Lamartine venture to reply—all tyranny is atheistical, all tyrants are atheists, their religious profession to the contrary notwithstanding? Very well: then why not state his proposition thus—'To love the people is to believe in God'? Or thus—'Not to love the people is not to believe in God'? How many believers in God would be found, either in Church or State, in any nation, by a strict application of this test?

Defining his own faith, he says—'My belief in God is not that vague, confused, indefinite, shadowy sentiment, which compels one to suppose a principle because he sees consequences, a cause where he contemplates effects, a source where he sees the rush of the inexhaustible river of life, of forms, of substances, absorbed for ever in the ocean, and renewed unceasingly from creation.' Such a belief, he declares, is only 'a mechanical sensation of the interior eye,—an instinct of intelligence, in some sort forced and brutal,—an evidence not reasonable, not religious, not perfect, not meritorious.' Yet, a few pages afterward, he seems to involve himself in contradiction by saying—'God is not a mere notion, an idea, an evidence. God is a law,—the living law, the supreme law, the universal law, the eternal law. God is a government!' Then how is it atheism to suppose a principle, because one sees consequences,—a cause where one contemplates effects'? If the Creator manifests himself through laws, principles, causes, results, then to ascertain these, and to pervert none, but live in obedience to what is required, is surely to be profoundly religious and reverent.

We think the statement, that 'sometimes the masses have been driven to Atheism by science,' is absurd upon the face of it; for would not the converse of this be an absurdity, namely, that sometimes the masses have been [illegible] to the adoration of God through ignorance of [illegible] laws? That many of those *savans*, 'geometers, physicians, arithmeticians, mathematicians, chemists, astronomers, measurers of distances, calculators of numbers,' &c. &c., have failed to keep the [illegible] law, and to cherish a devotional spirit, is [illegible]; but not more true of them, not so true of [illegible] as it is of the mass of the priesthood, who have [illegible] rally been hostile to science, and ostensibly devoted to religious investigation. It is one thing to affirm that *science* has sometimes driven the people to Atheism, and another that *scientific men* have sometimes been irreligious and skeptical; for science being of God, and but another name for the confession and recognition of his eternal wisdom, power and goodness, it cannot legitimately produce any such effect.

'Men,' says Lamartine, 'have been blotting out God, for a century past, from the souls of the people, and more especially in latter years. The masses have been driven to Atheism, they have been driven on every side and on every hand.' How has all this happened? Who are they who have done this evil deed? It is, we confess, in the answers to these questions—answers more implied than direct, but non

the less specific and invidious—as given by the accuser, that we feel the disquietude we have already expressed in regard to the character and tendency of the present Essay. First, Lamartine assails (as we have shown) certain 'geometers, physicians, arithmeticians, chemists, astronomers,' as belonging to this class of atheistical drivers of the people! His next talk is against those Political Economists, whose motto is, 'Grow rich,' whose declaration is, 'There is only one science which is good for any thing—it is the science of wealth,'—and by whom 'all legislation, all civilization, all religion, is reduced to a well-balanced account.' Next he tells us that 'for eighteen years, new sects, or, rather, posthumous sects, have disputed for the soul of the people, under the names of Fourierism, of Pantheism, of Communism, of Industrialism, of Economism, and, finally, of Terrorism . . . . There is not, at this moment, one of these schools of pretended apostles, prophets of the future, and saviours of the present, which is not Materialism in action.' He asks—'Are they astonished that the intellectual world resists them? Do they complain that the ignorant are their only disciples? Are they indignant that the ideas they attempt to spread, creep, like fetid mists, along the abysses of society, and excite, instead of enthusiasm, only *the fanaticism of hunger and thirst?* I can well believe it!'

These are singular impeachments, accusations and taunts, to come from a professed friend of the people! No marvel that he has been deposed in their confidence and affection; for while, as their honored leader in the revolution of 1848, he advocated in their behalf 'liberty, equality, fraternity,' he now derides the only efforts that are making to secure to them the blessings of freedom—efforts, it may be, not always wisely directed, not characterised by any strong moral elements, but still deserving of sympathy, to be regarded hopefully, as demonstrative that poor galled, overburdened, starving Humanity has yet something of manhood, self-respect, and sense of justice, to vindicate before the universe. Commend us to the 'Socialism' and 'Red Republicanism' of France, rather than to the aristocratic scorn, the priestly hatred, the conservative opprobrium, the governmental tyranny, against which they are contending. Whatever may be their distance from 'the kingdom of God,' in the true sense of that term, they are much nearer to it than their assailants,—as the publicans and harlots of old were nearer to it than the Scribes and Pharisees.

Now, mark! It is not against religious bigotry and superstition—against a hireling priesthood and a corrupt church—against the army or navy, or any portion of the accursed war system of France, which thrives only on the blood of the people—against the despotism of Louis Napoleon, as absolute in fact as was that of Louis Philippe, there being no freedom of speech or of the press;—no, it is not against any of these Lamartine testifies, it is not in these he perceives any repudiation of God, it is none of these which give him any alarm for the safety of society! There is no atheism in the Church or the State, only among the people! The Church and the State show their belief in God by increasing the burdens of the people, and reducing them to the verge of starvation! The people show they are without God by protesting against injustice, demanding equity, combining for mutual succor and protection, suggesting modes for a reorganization of society, and discarding the shams of a false religion, and the impositions of a spurious republicanism! It is not as of old—'The rulers of the people cause them to err, and they that are led of them are destroyed'—but it is among chemists, astronomers, mathematicians, and other scientific men, the destroyers of the people, the enemies of God are to be found!—men whose pursuits have been of real service to mankind, (whatever their theological notions,) in breaking down superstition, enlarging the field of useful knowledge, and quickening the dormant powers of the human mind. Of such folly, of such injustice, is Lamartine guilty in this Essay on 'Atheism among the People'!

The manner in which the earnest advocates of the working-classes of France are referred to—'that the ignorant are their only disciples'—'that their ideas creep along the abysses of society'—that they 'excite, instead of enthusiasm, only the fanaticism of hunger and thirst'—reminds us of the old inquiry—'Have any of the rulers believed on him?' and of the old accusation, 'he eateth with publicans and sinners, is a blasphemer, and a stirrer up of sedition'—and is but a repetition of the abuse to which reformers in all ages have been subjected. Where, on the scroll of history, does Lamartine find an instance in which a great reform was begun and consummated by the learned, the affluent, the influential? Has not every such reform been despised and rejected by these classes, and brought down upon it their concentrated hostility?

'The fanaticism of hunger and thirst!'—hunger seeking to be fed and thirst to be quenched, that absolute starvation of the body may not be inevitable! An idealist, who has enough to eat and to drink, and is in possession of all desirable luxuries, casts this taunt at the suffering millions and their advocates! It is unmanly and unchristian. This warning, which follows, is no better:—'Beware of abject Materialism, degrading Sensualism, gross Socialism, of besotted Communism; of all these doctrines of flesh and blood, of meat and drink, of hunger and thirst, of wages and traffic, which these corruptors of the soul of the people preach to you, as the sole thought, the sole hope, as the only duty and only end of man!' Reproachful epithets in abundance, easily uttered, and disgusting caricatures flippantly drawn! But are these to be taken for facts and arguments? Only by those have no sympathy for the oppressed. A people victimised in the name of God, for ages, and reduced to the last degree of endurance, speak slightly of the established religion, with its hideous God. 'Atheism!' They are famishing, and demand bread; naked, and claim necessary raiment; houseless, and plead for a shelter; landless, and ask for very limited homesteads; combined against by monopolists and sharpers, and in self-defence seek relief through associated effort and mutual co-operation. 'Abject Materialism! degrading Sensualism! gross Socialism! besotted Communism!' Such outcries are dastardly!

Lamartine concludes his Essay by telling the French people to seek God, but 'not in these Materialists! For God is not below,—he is on high!' The very cant of a reprobate priesthood and an apostate church. Now, the true God is near, and not afar off; and genuine godliness 'has the promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come'; truths which the 'wise and prudent' in France are unable to apprehend, but which the rash and foolish masses are beginning to perceive, and think ought to be reduced to practice.

The Origin of the Material Universe, with a description of the manner of the formation of the Earth, and events connected therewith, from its existence in a fluid state to the time of the Mosaic Narrative. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1850.

This is another ingenious attempt to account for the formation of the Material Universe. How, 'in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth,' is a question, the solution of which mankind in all ages have sought to discover. The subject is as sublime as it is intricate, and affords ample scope for scientific research. This pamphlet is written in a serious spirit, and modestly claims something of originality—the writer not being aware that any attempt has yet been made to account for the *method* employed by the Creator for the formation of water; or, at what particular stage of the earth's existence, it became a component part of its exterior, under the present order of its arrangement. His theory is, that the space occupied by the material universe has, from the creation, been filled with precisely the same materials as at present, and that these materials existed in the form of gases, and were kept in that state by caloric, which, with electricity, existed in a latent or passive state, until the Creator saw fit to arrange them in the order which enabled them to unite, or to be condensed in masses, and to be governed thereafter by natural laws which he has impressed upon them. As there is nothing bearing the name of matter, with which we are acquainted, that is not subject to the law of change, our author asks—'May not the same matter, which now composes the solar system, have been reduced to its gaseous form, and reformed, into systems of planets, and a sun, a thousand times before?' Is chaos then to come a thousand times again? On this point, we must pause awhile.

The Sources of Health and the Prevention of Disease; or, Mental and Physical Hygiene. By John A. Tarbell, M. D., Member of the Massachusetts Medical Society, and of the Homœopathic National Institute. Boston: Otis Clapp, 23 School Street—1850. pp. 170.

The old adage, that 'an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure,' has not yet become obsolete or without value. If people were a millionth part as anxious to know how to avoid disease, as they are to find a remedy for it after it has become deeply seated, there would be a world of suffering saved, and the longevity of our race greatly increased. This knowledge is to be obtained by an intelligent and earnest investigation of the laws of mind and matter, as pertaining alike to mental and physical aliment, exercise, adaptation and affinity. This neatly printed volume has evidently been prepared with care, and contains a great deal of valuable advice and information in a brief compass. Its object is to acquaint the reader with the character of those agents which exert an injurious influence upon health, and to afford instruction regarding means of adoption most practicable for the successful resistance of such evil agents. It therefore treats on food, drink, air, exercise, bathing, clothing, sleep, occupations, drugs, mental causes of disease, invisible influences affecting health, and homœopathy. We are pleased with the emphatic testimony which it bears against the use of alcoholic drinks. 'They are all, without an exception, injurious to the animal economy . . . The most commendable crusade ever undertaken against any of the diabolical agencies which obstruct man's path to heaven, is that now being carried on against the arch-enemy to human health and happiness,—alchohol; the accursed thing that man himself has taken pains to extract from the naturally harmless gifts of God. . . It matters not in what shape the enemy is put into the mouth, even if in not a sufficient force at once to steal away the brains; it still remains an enemy, and no ingenious device can possibly deprive it of that character.'

EQUAL SCHOOL RIGHTS MEETING.

The friends of this reform assembled at Belknap St. Church on Monday evening, April 22d. The Chairman being necessarily detained, John T. Hilton was unanimously called to preside, and stated that the object of the meeting was to consider the recent adverse decision of the Supreme Court, and to concert measures for further action.

The decision, as rendered by Chief Justice Shaw, was read by the Secretary, and commented upon by several speakers.

William C. Nell, in behalf of the committee, submitted the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That we have heard with surprise and regret the recent decision of the Supreme Court of this Commonwealth, in the case of Roberts vs. City of Boston; and with all due respect to that high tribunal, we still presume to think such cannot be the law, if it be true that the Constitution of 1780 be the supreme law of the State. But whether this be so or not, we still confide in the Legislature '*to establish justice*' in this particular, and save us from such mistakes, whether originating in that body or chargeable to the Bench; and to that end we pledge to each other our unceasing efforts, till the struggle results in victory.

Resolved, That the cordial thanks of the colored citizens of Boston are most sincerely and gratefully tendered Messrs. Charles Sumner and Robert Morris, counsel, and to Charles Theodore Russell, Esq., advocate in the School Board, for their faithful, generous and devoted efforts in our behalf; and we are proud to record the fact, that while thanks are all we have now to give for such assistance, it renders their championship of our cause the more marked and honorable—their reward having been found, as we believe, in the pleasure of the task.

Resolved, That we recognize with heartfelt approbation the honorable stand which our brother, Benjamin F. Roberts, has made for the school rights of the colored people of Boston, and for the fidelity with which he has persevered in maintaining them; and we assure him that, in the history of our struggles, and, we hope, our successes, his name will not be forgotten.

Resolved, That we hail with unalloyed satisfaction the fact that many parents and guardians among us are availing themselves of various means for the education of their children, independent of the present illegal exclusive system; and that, unmoved by opposition, whether from those without or within our proscribed circle, they are determined to bide their time, until an enlightened public opinion accord to them Equal School Rights.

Resolved, That a delegation be appointed to attend the approaching New England Anti-Slavery Convention, and there invoke the co-operation of all friends of free school education in Massachusetts, in securing to our children the rights so long withheld.

In accordance with the above, Robert Morris, John T. Hilton and Wm. C. Nell were unanimously selected.

The resolutions were discussed by Robert Johnson, Henry L. W. Thacker, John T. Hilton, Isaac H. Snowden, William C. Nell, Edward Jackson, Benjamin Weeden, Charles Mahony, Henry Weeden, and others, and on motion, adopted unanimously.

A vote of thanks was presented to William C. Nell and his coadjutors, for their efforts relative to the recent juvenile exhibition, the proceeds of which were devoted to the Equal School Rights fund.

On motion of Henry Weeden, a committee was appointed (with power to increase their number) for arranging a complimentary meeting or festival, as a tribute to Benjamin F. Roberts for his sacrifices and efforts in the Equal School Rights reform.

The following persons constitute the committee: Robert Johnson, Henry L. W. Thacker, Henry Weeden, Ottaway West, Edward Jackson, Angeline B. Gardner, Eunice R. Davis, Mary L. Armstead.

The resolutions were ordered to be published, and the meeting adjourned, subject to the call of the committee.

JOHN T. HILTON, *Chairman.*

WILLIAM C. NELL, } *Secretaries.*
ISAAC H. SNOWDEN, }

NORFOLK COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

Agreeably to notice, the annual meeting of the Norfolk County Anti-Slavery Society was held in the Temperance Hall, Dedham, on Thursday, 18th inst., commencing at 10 o'clock. After an opening speech by the President, a committee was appointed to nominate a list of officers for the ensuing year, who subsequently reported the following, which was adopted:

President,
[Edm]und Quincy, Dedham.

Vice Presidents,
Ri[illegible]
Ellis Clapp, Dorchester.
Samu[el illegible,] Medfield.
Lawson [K]en[r]ick, Brookline.
Elias Richay, Walpole.
Edwin Thomp[son, W]eymouth.
[illegible,] East Walpole.

Corresponding Secretary,
William I. Bowditch, Brookline.

Recording Secretary,
Anne W. Weston.

Treasurer,
Cornelius Cowing.

Executive Committee,
Franklin Williams, Roxbury.
Eliza H. Taft, Dedham.
Joseph R. Engley, Walpole.
John R. Morse, Walpole.
Hiram W. Blanchard, Dorchester.
Milton Z. Bullard, Bellingham.
Louisa A. Allen, Dedham.

The following letter was read to the meeting by the President:—

NORTH BELLINGHAM, April 16, 1850.

DEAR SIR:

I see by the last Liberator, that the Norfolk Co. A. S. Society is to hold its annual meeting on Thursday next. I have never shown my face at any of its meetings as yet, though for the past six years I have felt a deep interest in its proceedings, as well as in the cause generally. My reason for not attending the meetings heretofore, and now is, my business is such during the month of April, that I cannot leave home without too great a sacrifice.

I suppose I am unknown to most of the abolitionists of this county, but when I saw those remarks of Mr. Garrison in the last Liberator, I thought they meant me; so I had my choice, either to attend, send an apology, or have the consciousness of not having done my duty. I wish you to say to the meeting, that my heart is with them in all efforts to rescue humanity from the auction-block, and that I wish no higher praise than to be counted one of their number. I have long been of opinion with Toombs, of Georgia, that the only consistent agitators of the slavery question are the Garrisonians, (so called,) and of course, holding such opinions, I must labor and suffer reproach with them until I see greater light.

Yours truly, for the bondman,
MILTON Z. BULLARD.

Mr. Garrison, of Boston, presented the following series of resolutions for the consideration of the meeting:—

1. Resolved, That the 'ultraism' of abolitionism is inflexible justice; its 'fanaticism,' universal emancipation; its 'infidelity,' reverence for the eternal law of God, which is liberty; its 'madness,' unshaken confidence in the ultimate triumph of right over wrong; its 'fell purpose,' the abolition of slavery; its 'impracticableness,' certain and complete victory over all opposition.

2. Resolved, That with a cause which in all ages has received the homage of the truly great and good, and in which are bound up the destinies not only of this country but of the world,—the cause of absolute and impartial liberty,—we are not to be discouraged, not to be driven back, not to be put down; neither are we to be cheated, nor bribed, nor diverted from our course; be the popular agitation, dismay, indignation or violence what it may, be the perils or consequences what they may, we shall persevere to the end, giving no quarter to slavery or its abettors, and laying down the weapons of our moral warfare only when the last fetter is broken, and the song of jubilee is thundering heavenward.

3. Resolved, That in the recent death of John C. Calhoun, the sacred cause of liberty has been delivered from a persevering, inexorable, gigantic enemy—the Slave Power has lost its chosen champion; yet, 'archangel fallen' as he was, of monstrous purpose and demoniac ambition, he is a model man for imitation and emulation on the score of consistency, firmness, courage, devotion, indomitableness—qualities in him most frightfully perverted, but when consecrated to noble ends, invaluable and irresistible—qualities which the friends of the slave must possess and exhibit, in all conceivable emergencies, or they will labor in vain.

4. Resolved, That the Spirit of Liberty laughs to scorn the attempt of such traitors to her cause as Clay, Webster, and others in the Senate, to arrest the progress of the anti-slavery movement by artifices and stratagems and compromises, and fustian eulogies upon the Constitution and Union; for all such tricks and devices shall furnish just so much fresh fuel for that fire which is to melt all chains, and consume the last vestige of the slave system.

5. Resolved, That the history of the United States has been, from the beginning, but the record of the successful triumphs of slavery, and that each victory has been won by wading through the slaughter and miseries of growing generations of slaves, and marked by trophies of the ravished rights and ineffectual resistance of the nominally free.

6. Resolved, That the successive strides of Slavery, as it has stalked towards its design, from Kentucky to Louisiana, from Louisiana to Florida, from Florida to Texas, from Texas to California and New Mexico, have been each more haughty, more cruel and more crushing than its predecessor; and that the one now suspended over us threatens the widest and most enduring ruin of all, for the North as well as for the South, to the nice sense of the rights of freemen as well as to the hopes of the slaves.

7. Resolved, That as in each of these struggles between Liberty and Slavery, traitors have appeared, eager to purchase the smile of the tyrants by the sacrifice of humanity, and base enough to sell their birthright of civil liberty for a possible mess of political pottage, so this occasion has called forth, in the person of Daniel Webster, the great traitor of our history, before whose enormous infamy all former treason and apostacy look white.

8. Resolved, That the present Legislature of this State has shown itself to be stupid, cowardly, shuffling, impracticable, and somnolent, on all matters pertaining to freedom and progress, to a melancholy extent, if not beyond all precedent; that the termination of its session is to be looked for and hailed with eagerness and immense satisfaction; and that from the repetition of such an intolerable infliction on the body politic, the petition should be devoutly offered up—'God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts!'

9. Resolved, That we recognize with pleasure here and there, in both houses, among the members, an exception to this true confession and just sentence; but such a mass of 'dough' seems to be incapable of being affected by the presence of any leaven that may exist in it—thus constituting a notable exception to a well known declaration of Scripture.

The meeting was addressed by Samuel May, Jr., W. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Edmund Quincy, Rev. Henry Giles, Edward L. Keyes, Edwin Thompson, Warren Allen, and Richard Clapp, and the resolutions unanimously adopted. Earnest, eloquent, and impassioned remarks were made, during the discussion, worthy of the sacred cause of liberty; and the only regret is, that thousands were not present to be quickened by their utterance.

The hospitality of the friends in Dedham was, as usual, bountiful to excess to all who chose to partake of it—a numerous and goodly company indeed.

EDMUND QUINCY, *President.*

ANNE W. WESTON, } *Secretaries.*
WM. I. BOWDITCH, }

ERRATA. In the faithful admonitory Letter to Daniel Webster, from Rev. Joseph P. Fessenden of South Bridgeton, Me., published in the Liberator of the 12th inst., twelfth line from the commencement, for 'declaration,' read 'degradation.' Twelfth line from the close of the Letter, for 'Congress,' read 'College.' We regret these blunders.

We erroneously credited the report of the proceedings of the Anti-Webster Mass Meeting held in Plymouth, to the Old Colony Memorial, instead of the North Bridgewater Reporter.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PARTY.

LONDON, March 28, 1850.

DEAR SIR:

Very recently, a meeting was held here of the Church of England party. That Church is called, you know, 'The Church by law established,' and its establishment and the struggles amongst the priests of the days of the reformation in England, (so called,) was as to which of the sects should get the loaves and the fishes, and led to the expatriation of the Pilgrim Fathers; and looking with the eyes of this after age, we may say fortunately sent forth the Mayflower to America. The Episcopalians got the loaves and fishes into their keeping, then succeeded in getting a variety of oppressive laws passed to keep down the Catholics and other Dissenters, and finally seated themselves upon the shoulders of the people, with power to take a tenth of the produce of the kingdom, the cathedrals, state colleges, donations, lands and other property, estimated to amount together, to at least nine millions a year, out of which they will not even repair their own churches, but make rates upon the people, by which rates they compel the Dissenter, who does not and cannot conscientiously join in their worship, to repair their churches for them. As to the cathedrals which were erected by the Catholics, whenever they are dilapidated or burnt down, the Bishop and other church dignitaries set forward a subscription for their repair, upon the ground of their antiquity, giving the go-by to the fact, that the Catholic priests, when they had the tythes, not only repaired, but erected the buildings.

Well, this Church party had a meeting the other day on the subject of education, and for the purpose of scolding the Government for not allowing them to have a large dip into the public purse, for the purpose of education, without being responsible to Government for its application. The truth is, that all the sects here are quarrelling together as to the shares they are respectively to get of a sum which has been voted by Parliament to be applied to the various bodies who are desirous to educate the people, most of whom feel themselves interested to do so, that they may give to the uprising generation what they all agree to call religious education, but what they each practically realize in plenty of creed and catechism, according to their own doctrinal views. Religion with them means theology, and they make the poor children pronounce in words their particular church creed before they can have the slightest comprehension of what they are made to affirm. But, to return to my Church of England friends.

The following is the record, taken from the public papers, of the doings and sayings of a Church of England party. You will see that they are by no means small men as to worldly position, and you will also see, from the notions they broach, that if they were sincere in what they said, they were by no means large-minded; but it is pretty clear that they were subtle enough to see, that if there were no creed, there would be no State Church, no Bishoprics, with fifty thousand dollars a year, and Archbishops with double that income. The following is the report:—

'A meeting of the friends of National Education was held at Willis's rooms on Thursday. Mr. Talbot, Q. C., presided. The Bishop of Winchester and the Bishop of Glasgow, the Warden of Chichester College, the Rev. Dr. Molesworth, Archdeacon Manning, Mr. G. A. Dennison, Lord Nelson, the Hon. B. Cavendish, Mr. Napier, M. P., and Mr. Roundell Palmer, M. P., took part in the proceedings. The Rev. Archdeacon Manning opened with prayer. The Chairman stated that the correspondence between the National Society and the Committee of Education was now at an end; and the Church is thrown on her own internal resources. Mr. G. A. Dennison said, that '*all education flowed from, and necessarily depended upon, the doctrine of regeneration in baptism*—that doctrine which had so monstrously been made of late the subject of appeal to a court not necessarily composed of Christians.' They would have no legislating for the Church by the Committee of Education, no Minister of Public Instruction in England, or, more dangerous, the office without the name; no godless Colleges: the seed might be sown, but it should be crushed ere it grew to a plant. The Rev. W. Sewell pronounced the system of Education, *apart from the dogmatical teaching of the Church*, as ripe with the seeds of anarchy. IT INEVITABLY DESTROYED VENERATION FOR THE CREATOR, LOVE FOR THE PARENT, RESPECT FOR THE TEACHER, AND OBEDIENCE TO THE STATE. Resolutions were passed, which characterized the Committee of Council on Education as an incipient legislative Board of Public Instruction; denounced the aggressions of that body, especially the establishment of the Normal School at Kneller Hall, at the expenditure of more than £30,000 of the public money, without previous Parliamentary sanction; and affirmed the necessity of an appeal to Parliament for a removal of the impediments which preclude many church schools from receiving the public money voted for education. An address to the Queen and to the two Houses of Parliament was adopted.'

These priests not only lord it over us by making us pay them large incomes, and build great churches, but they do it in the most domineering and abusive style you can well imagine. The following specimen of a cursing parson, which occurred at the same meeting, with the comments of the editor, I take from another newspaper, the Examiner of Feb. 23d:—

'About ten days ago, there was a meeting at Willis's Rooms, convened for the purpose of condemning the measures of the Government for imparting national education. The business of the meeting commenced with prayer for a blessing, which was followed, not long after, by the bitterest imprecation. The Rev. Dr. Biber having been charged with a resolution inveighing against the Kneller Hall Normal School, held forth in this strain, as reported in the Guardian:—

'"The question had arisen, what was Kneller Hall? It was, in fact, the embodiment of a long-cherished and most pernicious theory—the theory of an education paid out of the public rates, and from which every thing like distinctive and positive religion was banished, [for "distinctive and positive religion" read, our particular creed and dogma.] The decision of the House of Lords, in 1839, induced the Government to give up its scheme; but, to use the words of one who had recently been made a Baronet for his services in the cause of religion, it was only kept for a while in an unobtrusive state. Immediately after the accession of Government to office in 1846, the scheme was revived, and an expenditure of £30,000 had now been incurred in erecting an institution which was intended to deprive the Church of its proper functions as the educator of the poor in the land. It was avowed by the Privy Council that the only Gospel taught at Kneller, Hall was that which was comprised in the moral agencies relied upon by the Poor Law Commissioners for the elevation of the poor. Of him who sought to introduce such a Gospel into the education of this country, he hesitated not to say, without any personal feeling, 'LET HIM BE ACCURSED!' and he believed that the events which would be witnessed by the next two generations would fully justify the use of such language."

'On the platform, listening to this imprecation, and not raising a voice against it, if not responding to it, were the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Bishop of Exeter and the Bishop of Chichester; Lords Nelson, Campden, Fielding, Castlereagh and Lyttleton; Archdeacons Manning, Thorp, Harrison and Allen, and a long list of reverend dignitaries and gentlemen. None of these persons, so zealous in the cause of religion, felt moved to reprove the cursing priest, or to protest that their feelings revolted against his unchristian, his diabolical imprecation. Is the school in which this man learned to curse, the school in which the spirit of meekness and charity is to be acquired? We judge of a tree by its fruits; and of the system of education of which the Rev. Dr. Biber is both a specimen and an advocate, the foul curse that falls from his tongue is a sad and sufficient sample. Amongst brother bigots, he is called a shining light, and a shining light he is; like those beacons which mark the rock to be shunned, and which signify, keep far from me, as you value safety and would avoid destruction.'

These things ought to be handed forth to you Americans, that you may see how priests will act with you, if you once give them an establishment; and seeing that you have taken so many bad things from us—except the form of our Constitution, which, however, is, we must admit, a grand exception—you may, if your mind is not kept alive to it, be misled into the adoption of this great incubus. Depend upon it, if you should ever, as a people or State, become so demented as once to let the priests get upon your shoulders, that you never afterwards will be able to stand erect, until you are able to throw them off again.

It will be pleasing to you and your readers, who are anxious to mark progress, to know that this subject of education is much discussed here, and that the working people have their minds awakened to its importance. Mr. W. J. Fox, who moved a bill in our House of Commons during the last week to facilitate unsectarian education, mentioned a society of working men who had put forth a manifesto, in which they said, 'they could not consent to their children being apportioned among the religious sects, or to the plastic minds of their children being subjected to any external pressure which would give them a bias towards any particular notions. That that appeared to them to be the very way to cherish those theological distinctions which unhappily divided men. Religion, they said, was intended to prepare men for heaven, and why should it be made the ground for splitting men into sections on earth, and for designating them by unpronounceable shibboleths? They had been called a multitude of untutored savages; and they had sat still, expecting the religious denominations would, in charity and pity for their sufferings, lay aside their peculiar views, which they themselves confessed were not essential to salvation. But they had waited in vain; controversy had waxed higher and higher, and they had been forgotten in the fray.' It is cheering to see that hard-working men are thinking and acting. Your struggles in America are to win individual personal equality for the colored children; the struggle in England, of the thoughtful portion of the poorer classes, is to prevent their children's minds from being perverted and hardened by extraordinary theological dogmas, as the condition of being taught the instrumentalities of knowledge.

EDWARD SEARCH.

☞ EMILY RUSSELL, the beautiful slave girl, for whom Bruin and Hill, the slave traders, demanded $1800, as the only condition on which they would restore her to her mother, is dead. So says a letter from Mr. Hill, dated Griffin, Ga., March 23. The letter says that she died of scarlet sore throat, but does not say where or when she died. Hill protests that he had determined not to sell Emily at the South, but to bring her back to Alexandria, and let her mother have her.

Distressing Casualty.—On Wednesday, 10th inst., at Richmond, Va., a horse, attached to a cart, took fright and ran away. The driver, a negro lad, was thrown off and severely hurt, and in his headlong course, the horse encountered a negro woman, who was crushed to death almost immediately by the left wheel of the car. Further on, he knocked down a Mrs. Regnault so violently as to produce instant death. Mrs. Regnault was very much esteemed in Richmond, and her untimely death has caused a general sadness in that community.

Melancholy Loss of Life.—Mr. George H. Foote, who went to San Francisco in the bark J. Wells, Jr., from New Haven, has written to his friends in that city, that five of his fellow-voyagers in the J. Wells, Jr., were drowned in the harbor of San Francisco, Jan. 28th. Their names are as follows:—Nathaniel W. Wallace, 1st officer, of Beverly, Mass.; Wellington Tuttle, Charles W. Foster, and Thomas F. Castle, of Bristol, Conn.; and Ezekiel W. Nettleton, of Milford, Conn.

Cholera on the Mississippi.—Twelve cabin passengers died of cholera on board the steamer Commodore Perry, during her last trip from New Orleans to Island No. 8, where she got aground. The officers of the boat were all sick with the disease. The steamer Buckeye had several cases of cholera on board before reaching Memphis from New Orleans. Three of the crew of the steamer Uncle Sam died of it on board the boat, in the port of New Orleans. Two deaths from cholera occurred at St. Louis during the week ending the 1st inst.

Frozen to Death.—The Trenton True American of 15th inst. says that two young men, aged 19 and 21 years, named Naylor, brothers, were frozen to death during the storm on the night of the 12th. They were employed in dredging for oysters, near Weymouth, in that State. They were young men highly esteemed in the neighborhood.

A Couple of Murders by a Maniac.—At a village about five miles from Edinburgh, Scotland, on March 17th, a physician named Wilson, aged about fifty, and his mother, aged about ninety, were killed by a person named Pearson, who had lately been discharged from a Lunatic Asylum. It appears that at a late hour on Sunday night, Pearson called on Dr. Wilson for medical assistance. The next morning, the bodies of both the doctor and his mother were found. They had apparently been killed with the kitchen tongs and poker. Pearson was found in one of the beds, and was conveyed to jail.

☞ The bark Sherwood, from New Orleans, reports that on the 1st inst., in lat. 32 48, lon. 76 56, the man at the wheel heard some one hail the bark. On looking to the leeward, he discovered a man in the water, on a caboose house, about half a mile off, and succeeded in getting him on board, when he proved to be Capt. Hunt, of the brig Jno. Hill, Bristol, for Cardenas, before reported lost, and all hands perished, but the second mate. Capt. H. was considerably bruised and exhausted, having been clinging to the house for thirty-eight hours. Soon after, the Sherwood bore down to the wreck of the brig, but found no one on board—she being on her beam ends.

Dreadful Railroad Accident.—We understand from passengers by the last night's train from Syracuse, that Mr. Francis, conductor of the freight train on the Utica and Syracuse road, was killed in passing under the bridge immediately east of the tunnel at Syracuse. Mr. F. was on top of the cars, was knocked down by coming in contact with the bridge, and most of the heavily-laden cars passed over his body, cutting off one of his limbs, and mangling his body shockingly. Mr. F. was much esteemed on the road, and we believe this was his first trip as conductor. He was formerly from Watertown, Jefferson county, and an unmarried man.—*Oswego Com. Times.*

Railroad Bridge Accident.—An unfortunate accident occurred upon the Nashua and Lowell Railroad, on Saturday evening last, to Mr. Leonard Dearborn, baggage-master on the Boston, Concord and Montreal Railroad. He was standing on the top of one of the cars, and when coming to the bridge within the limits of Lowell, he was knocked off and taken up insensible, though alive. He died on Monday. He was a very steady and worthy young man, beloved by all who knew him, and was the main support of his mother.

Explosion of the Steamer Hercules.—The names of those killed by the explosion of the steam tow boat Hercules, below New Orleans, were—J. F. Miller, pilot; James Riddle, third engineer, and a son of Captain Riddle; William Hammond, John Moran, William Hazen, Thomas Murphy and Rufus Tarbox—all deck hands. Among the scalded were John Fullerton and the following deck hands—James Miller, Oliver Arnold and G. Sherman.

Awful Steamboat Disaster—One Hundred Lives Lost! The 'Belle of the West,' Capt. James, was burned one mile below Warsaw, Kentucky, at one o'clock on the morning of the 23d inst. It is stated that one hundred passengers were burned and drowned by jumping overboard—officers saved.

Melancholy Shipwreck.—British schooner Crown, Captain Rolf, was lost on West Quoddy Head, during the storm of Saturday night last, and all hands perished. Some articles of female clothing were afterwards washed ashore.

☞ On Tuesday of last week, a rencontre took place at Far Rockway, Long Island, between two neighbors, Mr. Oliver Doxey and Mr. Peter Pearsall, in which the latter was killed. Doxey has given bail, and will be tried at the next Oyer and Terminer.

☞ We learn from a St. Louis paper, that a band of Sioux Indians, headed by their chief, Little Crow, recently attacked a family of Chippewas, numbering fourteen persons, at Falls Croix, and murdered them all.

☞ Another fight among the Philadelphia firemen occurred on Monday night of last week. The reporter of the Inquirer says that guns and pistols were discharged both in the street and from the adjacent houses. A small boy, named John Farley, was shot in the arm and hand. The hand will probably require amputation.

The English coast was visited by a severe hurricane on the 30th of March, causing much destruction of property and a frightful loss of life. Amongst other vessels lost was the John R. Skiddy, which was driven ashore on the coast of Weckford, and totally wrecked. Capt. Shipley, passengers and crew saved.

The Howard, from New Orleans, was also wrecked at the entrance of the Mersey. The steamer Adelaide, from Dublin to London, was lost near the mouth of the Thames, and every soul, numbering 200, on board, was drowned. The coast is every where strewn with portions of vessels that have fallen a prey to the elements.

Advices to the last of November have been received from Hobart Town, Van Dieman's land, announcing the arrival there of Smith O'Brien and his associates in the Irish rebellion of 1849. The felons were granted tickets of leave, on condition of their engaging that their liberty should not be used as a means to effect their escape. All except O'Brien accepted the boon. He has been sent under surveillance to Maria Island.

☞ It is stated in the Boston papers, that a handsome sum has already been raised for Prof. Webster's family. The widow of the late Dr. Parkman heads the list with $500, which has already reached above $20,000.

Election in the Fourth District.—The Governor has ordered an election in the Fourth District on the 27th of May. Let the friends of freedom now go to work in earnest. Let no effort be spared to secure the election of Mr. Palfrey.—*Repub.*

Death of Mr. Campbell.—Mr. Thomas J. Campbell, Clerk of the U. S. House of Representatives, died on Saturday morning, 13th instant, at 1 o'clock. Mr. Young, a Democrat from Illinois, has been elected to the vacant post by one majority.

To be Hung.—The Governor and Council of Massachusetts have decided not to commute the sentence of death pronounced upon Pearson, who murdered his wife and children. He is to be hung on the 24th of July.

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURES IN BARNSTABLE COUNTY.

LORING MOODY, Agent of the Barnstable County Anti-Slavery Society, will lecture as follows, viz:—

Barnstable,	Friday,	April	26.
Centreville,	Sunday,	"	28.
Osterville,	Monday,	"	29.

The friends in the above places are requested to make all needful arrangements.

COURSE OF LECTURES.

☞ W. M. FERNALD will repeat, by request, the Course of four Lectures, delivered last winter, on the following connected subjects:—God, Nature, Man, and Human Society. At Washingtonian Hall, 21 Bromfield street, every Sunday afternoon. Seats free.

NOTICE.

Friends of the slave, and strangers on a visit to the city during Anniversary week, can be entertained with *good* board and private accommodations at 330 Pearl street. WILLIAM P. POWELL.
New York, April 15, 1850.

[☞ Our friend Powell has a large and commodious house, well furnished and well kept, in a very central location, and as a worthy and enterprising colored citizen is specially deserving of anti-slavery patronage.]—*Ed. Lib.*

☞ GRAND MAY-DAY FESTIVAL! ☜

At ESSEX HALL, corner of Essex and Washington streets, on the evening of May 1st, (Wednesday.) DANCING, SINGING, and other ENTERTAINMENTS. The reformatory public generally are invited. Tickets for Gentlemen, 50 cts.—for Ladies, 25 cts. To be had at Crosby & Nichols's, 111 Washington street—at Mitchell's (apothecary) 579 Washington street—at Bela Marsh's, 25 Cornhill—at Lloyd's Daguerreotype Room, 91 Washington street—and at the door.

☞ The Liberator, No. 4, year 1844, is needed to complete a file. Any one forwarding the same to the office No. 21 Cornhill, will receive grateful thanks.

DIED,

In this city, April 12th, John Griffin, supposed to be 95. The congregation of Belknap Street Baptist Church, of which he was for many years a member, will long miss the venerable patriarch, who was so constant in attendance, and fervid in his devotional exercises.

In this city, on the 15th inst., Ann Telford, wife of Joseph Scarlett, aged 33; a member of the Belknap st. Baptist Church. A large circle of relatives and acquaintances mingle their sympathies for the loss of one whose life was characterised by the most amiable and excellent qualities. COM.

☞ We trust this Panorama will be liberally patronised, whatever may be the opinions of individuals on the anti-slavery question. The visiter will see an affecting delineation of slavery and the slave-trade, without any exaggeration of their enormities. Mr. Brown deserves much credit for the enterprise he has displayed in getting such a Panorama completed. We believe it is to be exhibited next week in the same hall.—*Ed. Lib.*

POETRY.

From the Boston Republican.

WEBSTER.

The mustering hosts of liberty
  A recreant leader mourn,
For at the shrine of tyranny
  Allegiance he has sworn.

By eloquence and reason made
  The mightiest of his race,
He might have striven undismayed
  In danger's foremost place.

Wealth, zeal and honor, love and lives
  He found at his control,
But bartered them for shining gyves
  To wear upon his soul.

The friend of right, his manly strains
  Would be his country's pride,
When slavery in rusting chains,
  Forged by itself, has died.

The dauntless foe of threatened wrongs,
  His name would ever shine
In conquering freedom's battle-songs
  Along the strand of time.

But with oppression's fortune now
  His destiny is bound,
And with oblivion's wreath his brow
  By mercy will be crowned.

CHARLES LIST.

From the Boston Christian Freeman.

SPEECH OF HON. W. H. SEWARD,

ON THE ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

No word or breath broke on the air,
No sneer of scorn, as proudly there,
Confronting Freedom's friends and foes,
SEWARD with flashing eye arose.
He pointed to the glowing West,
Where sweetly on Pacific's breast
A new-born empire, veined with gold,
Heaving with hearts all warm and bold,
Flung upward to the azure sky
Our banner bright, *our* eagle's eye;
And sending o'er the mighty main
The thunder of *our* guns again,
Till Ocean to the mountain's dun
Gave back the echo, *Thirty-One.*
And when he pictured how the name
Of *Slavery* was struck with shame
From off that scroll which yet shall be
A spell, a watch-word for the free,—
The tremor of a rose-leaf's fall
Was heard within that Senate Hall.
How more than mortal seemed the flow
Of those great thoughts;—and mark, the glow
Is on the cheek of *Hale* and *Clay*,
As clouds lit up by dying day.
And when he told how rich and rare
The gems of California were,—
How fair her brow, how pure her vest,
Her foot upon Pacific's breast,
A vision blest it seemed to be:
Why not a State all vast and free?
His tone is changed—his lip and brow
Are breathing scorn and loathing now;
Accusing angels from on high
Would thunder thus—'Reject her—why?'
Why do we dare reject her claim
To our just laws and mighty name?
It is because—let echo fail
To whisper of the blushing tale—
The real cause that bondage there
Must ne'er pollute her sacred air,—
And we must thus, on western wave,
Fling back the gem Heaven freely gave.
He painted her a rival power,
And terrible in future hour,
Tempting our navies with her store,
And ruling Asia's ancient shore.
How Freedom's cause, thus struck with blight,
Must struggle on through storm and night,
Whilst California, like a tower
By Magic raised, in fatal hour
Might frown above our temples vast
As demon of the whirlwind's blast.
Again his voice flowed sweetly on
As waftings of a mountain song,
And brighter than a seraph's throne;
The world, he said, that was our own,
With two vast Oceans as the wings
On which ten thousand precious things
Were borne to this our temple free,
Where all may bend the grateful knee,
And lifting to our Father's gaze
The purity of freemen's praise,
Give welcome to this angel guest,—
Give welcome now, and be ye blest.
Crush not the confidence she gives;
Blight not the love that gladly lives.
Fold to your heart, till she shall be
A branch from out the parent tree,
And then nor storm nor time shall sever
The faith she owes to us forever.
But why rehearse the glorious tale?
It floats upon each passing gale;
Spirits unseen are on their way
To regions blest by endless day;
And when they reach the holy spheres,
A shout of praise a thousand years
Shall echo on the gleaming shore,
Where sorrow's sighs are heard no more.
He called on God to bless the day
When *Compromise* should lose her sway,
And human hearts no more be sold,
Nor man be bartered here for gold,—
And Liberty's pure eyes shall ne'er
Glisten again with shame's sad tear,
When gazing on the giant child
She reared amid the western wild,
To bear the torch that yet shall blaze
A beacon light for every gaze.

Richville, St. Lawrence Co., N.Y. HELEN.

From the True Democrat.

LINES TO JOHN P. HALE,

On reading the debate in the U. S. Senate, upon the reception of a petition against the extension of slavery, &c.—Feb. 15, 1850.

Oh, let them jibe, and laugh, and sneer,
  The base betrayers of the free!
What are their pitiful reproofs,
  Their pangless spite, to one like thee?
I love to think how thou canst smile,
While they in impotence revile.

What! would they point their shafts of reed
  To strike the eagle, where he flies?
What! fling their flimsy jesseys up
  To draw the free soul from the skies;
To break its soaring wings of light,
And quench its flash in slavery's night?

As well might some poor, pampered cur
  Rob Afric's lion of her young,
Or hush the royal tiger's voice
  Bengal's pathless wilds among;
As such as *these* choke down thy strong
Denunciation of the wrong!

Ay, let them gather round their god,
  And strive to shield him from the storm;
While fiery hail and burning truth
  Menace his foul and loathsome form;
Then high above them, weeping, dart
Thy flashing bolts into his heart.

Thus shalt thou win the high regard
  Of all the noble and the true;
And Freedom's grant, a rich reward
  For the clear note thy bugle blew,
When o'er the steep and starry way
Thou led'st her armies to the fray.

Fearless, unfaltering, ever still
  Be true unto thy lofty aim;
And future time shall yet record
  Thy glory and th' oppressor's shame;
While Freedom's son shall never fail
To venerate the name of HALE.

EDWARD H. HOWARD.

Reformatory.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Romans 13:1, 6. Our respected brother, Amos Dresser, has given an explanation of this passage, which I beg leave to review. He gives, as the literal meaning, the following:—'Rulers are God's ministers for good to them that do good. They are simply God's *servants*, and can neither bless nor curse, except as God directs. Their acts are so overruled of God, that whatever may be their design, God causes them to work for good to those who love him. In this sense, the sons of Jacob and Pharaoh were God's ministers for good to Joseph. "Ye meant it for evil," says Joseph, "but God meant it for good." Nebuchadnezzar was thus a minister of God for good to Daniel, to Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego; Haman to Mordecai, &c.'

Our brother says, the passage means 'just what it says.' Now I ask, does it say what he has written in the above quotation, or any thing like it? The question is not whether God overrules evil for good, or whether he causes the persecutions and all the afflictions of those who love him to work for their good, which indeed are glorious truths; the question is, is this the truth *of this passage?* Is this the subject on which the inspired writer is treating? I affirm that it is not. There is no reference at all in the passage to those abuses of power, of which civil magistrates are sometimes guilty. The reference is to their legitimate rightful acts of restraining men from doing evil and punishing evil doers. This is manifest on the face of the passage, and is proved by the entire connection. The fact that rulers are represented as being 'not a terror to good works, but to the evil,' clearly proves the incorrectness of our brother's exposition; for, according to this, rulers should have been represented as a terror to good works. That they may be so occasionally, is no proof that this passage has reference thereto.

Moreover, that the reference is to rightful civil authority, and to just laws for the protection of human rights, is further manifest, by the declaration that 'he is the minister of God to thee for good,' of whom we have no reason to 'be afraid,' if we 'do that which is good.' According to the exposition reviewed, we have reason to be afraid of the power, even if we do that which is good. The fear referred to is a fear grounded on the requisitions of the powers that be; the plain import is, that he who will do good, has no reason to fear, *because these requisitions are good.* This is the apostle's argument. It is indeed a precious truth, that holy confidence in God will elevate us above the fear of evil, in the season of persecution by civil governors who abuse their power, and in all times of trouble; but this is a truth to which this passage has no reference.

This is still further proved by the declaration, 'Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, (i. e., to escape the wrath and punishment of the civil power,) but *for conscience' sake.*' This demonstrates that the inspired apostle recognises the civil magistrate as the minister of God for good, *as enacting good laws;* for to such *only* ought we to be subject 'for conscience' sake.' It is said by Mr. Dresser, that 'Nebuchadnezzar was a minister of God for good to —— Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego—Haman to Mordecai,' &c. Was it needful for the worshippers of the living God to be subject for conscience' sake to the idolatrous mandate of the Chaldean monarch? How manifestly irrelevant are such cases to the subject of our present consideration!

But is it not an undeniable fact, that the governments of the world have been and still are tyrannical? Do they not frame mischief by a law? Do not the American 'powers that be' rob millions of the human brotherhood of all their rights? Most assuredly. Now, the question is, *Do they do so because they possess no rightful authority at all, or because they wickedly transcend the boundaries of rightful authority?* Shall we reason against the use of a thing from its abuse? Because school-masters sometimes abuse their authority, is there no rightful office of school-master? Because nominally Christian bishops have been lords over God's heritage, is there no rightful office of bishops or elders in the Christian Church?

Paul was no stranger to the occasional tyranny of the civil powers, and their impious attempts to contravene the laws of God. This, however, did not prevent the recognition of these powers as the ministers of God for good, to whom Christians were to be subject for conscience' sake. He states the general principle. Exceptions, indeed, there are. Every enactment which opposes the law of righteousness and God is a nullity. Subjection to it is rebellion against the Most High.

While the powers that be enact and enforce, by reasonable penalties, just and equal laws, it is obvious that they are, *in fact*, the ministers of God for good. Imperfection attaches to every thing human. Injustice attaches to some civil enactments and to their penalties. Rulers may be tyrants *in some acts*, while, in respect to their maintaining of common law, which protects our property and persons, they are the ministers of God for good. Our esteemed brother remarks, 'Nero was God's servant to the Christians at Rome, as by his most cruel and hellish persecutions, he gave them an opportunity to show the power of the Gospel.' I affirm that in maintaining common law, which protected the persons and property of the general community from outrage, Nero was the minister of God for good; and that in the case of the persecutions referred to, he was the minister of the devil for evil, although God overruled it for good. So in respect to our own civil government. So far as it enacts and maintains righteous laws, it is the minister of God for good; so far as it deprives men of their liberty, (unforfeited by crime,) their wives and their children, and the fruits of their toil, it is the ministers of the devil for evil, although, as Commodore Stockton supposes, the Sovereign of the universe may have some important purpose in view in permitting it. Not an iota can such a consideration diminish the national guilt. In all clear and terrible demonstration does the charge stand before high Heaven against us, that it is with '*wicked hands*' we are maintaining this unrighteous and cruel system.

Some of our beloved brethren suppose that all reference to the civil power for protection or redress is incompatible with perfect confidence in God. It appears that Paul thought otherwise, when, in the hour of peril, he called for a Centurion, and sent to the chief captain, who sent him an escort of two hundred men for his protection, with whom Paul went to Cesarea. Acts 23. Be this as it may, however, it is manifestly no evidence of distrust of the divine power, to use those means for our protection which God himself has appointed. Is it not presumption to reject them?

Suppose, now, that the entire system of civil government should be abandoned. Suppose that there should be no longer 'a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.' Every prison-door is thrown open. Every penalty is effaced from the statute book. Law is reduced to simple advice. If judgment against evil works should never be executed, would the hearts of the children of men be fully set in them *to do good?* Would the robber and the incendiary cease their depredations? Can the most zealous non-resistant say that our legal penalties have *no* efficacy to restrain evil doers, and that the civil magistrate bears the sword in vain?

The question is not, whether our system of jurisprudence needs reformation, nor is it whether or not it is our duty to manifest love and kindness towards the very worst of the human brotherhood. O that we may ever do this! I do not believe that there is a man on earth so depraved as to be entirely and always unaffected by love and kindness. The principles and habits of wicked men, however, are not changed by their transient emotions. Moreover, they are unhappily subject to other and opposite influences, which urge them on to acts of iniquity. The question is, whether or not, in the present depraved state of the human family, the order, the peace, the safety and well-being of the brotherhood, require that evil doers shall be restrained by penal laws? Has not the infinitely wise and benevolent Creator and Father of all instituted such laws from the beginning of the world? Did he not threaten the children of Israel with punishments for disobedience? Was it not by the suffering of God's righteous judgments that they were brought to repentance? True wisdom adapts means to the end. If mild means are inadequate, (as they certainly are in some cases,) love itself demands those which are severe.

HENRY GREW.

Philadelphia, April 10, 1850.

From the Practical Christian.

DR. JOHN W. WEBSTER.

The newspapers have overflowed with the heart-sickening details of this man's trial, conviction, and sentence to the gibbet. The charge to the jury, their verdict, and the sentence of the prisoner to death, appear to have proceeded from men of intelligence and firmness, in whom deep feelings of humanity, and perhaps conscientious misgivings as to the rightfulness of inflicting death on a guilty fellow-creature, struggled against their respect for the law of retaliation. Probably no set of men more reluctantly and humanely conformed to the anti-Christian law of 'life for life.' Well might it be so, after all the light which has shone on this subject. That the religion of Jesus Christ solemnly and imperatively forbids weak and sinful men to take 'life for life, eye for eye,' &c., is too plain to dispute, about. And that this prohibition is fully justified by reasons founded in the nature of things, enlightened moral philosophy will at length perceive and affirm. We would not take the responsibility of deliberately shedding the blood, or choking to death, the blackest hearted murderer in existence, for worlds,—no, not to save our own mortal life. Let those tremble, who, in obedience to a vindictive religious sentiment, a barbaric custom, an anti-christian law, and a retaliatory public opinion, consent to act as judges, jurors, executioners, or accessaries in such cases! They may be as slavishly conscientious as the old worshippers of Moloch, when with parental anguish they threw their first-born into the flames of Tophet, or as the widows of India, in resigning themselves to death on the funeral pile of their husbands; yes, they may feel that it is their *duty* that they *must* kill the murderer; yet they take a responsibility that no *Christian* can endure.

We will have no hand in such deeds—no part in the execution of such laws—no participation in a government which swears its officers and citizens to precipitate their guilty fellow-creatures into the world of spirits before their time by any mode of human torture or death. But there are enough who are ready for all this; alas, there are enough who dare to say, 'Lord, Lord,' before the Mediatorial throne, while with swift tongues and eager hands they uphold the gallows as an indispensable protection of Christian society against murder. Let them do their vindictive and bloody work on their own responsibility. Let them demonstrate that they are wiser than their acknowledged Savior, Lawgiver and King. Let them dream by night, and walk about by day, amid the ghosts of the wretches they have executed. Let them go on sentencing their guilty fellow-creatures to death—shedding tears and saying prayers from the court-house to the gibbet. And when they cry to God for mercy, in view of their own sins, let them try to say, 'Have mercy on us, O Lord, even as we have had mercy on our fellows whom we punish with death!'

Webster will be hung. Why should he not be? It can hardly be doubted, that if any man ever deserved such a fate, he does. No man ought to be. It is an abomination. But the predominant religionists insist upon it. The majority of the people, under the lead of these religionists, love to have it so. Most of our learned, wealthy, and easy-conditioned people are for it.* Our politicians and martial heroes give their Draconic voices loudly in its favor. Our Governor and Council treat petitions for commutation with increasing contempt. [i. e. in the case of that poor ignorant colored convict, Washington Goode.] Our Legislators refuse further to consider petitions for the abolition of Capital Punishment. And the vilest of the vile in our brothels, our gambling hells and dram-shops, precious souls! are in this particular all on the side of the popular religion, law and order. A hanging is a carnival to these worthies. They only complain that the government will not let them feast their eyes on the spectacle *ad libitum*—instead of making a sacrament of it for an *elect few*. What then can those do who sincerely abhor, disfellowship and abominate this State murdercide? Petitions are already out for the Executive to commute Webster's sentence. We have received one. We cannot sign it under present circumstances—much as we desire the boon asked. We feel insulted and trifled with by the powers that be, and their abettors at large. We will sign a solemn remonstrance and protest against the whole hanging concern, root and branch—principle, law and practice; but we must wait awhile ere we appear in the character of a suppliant before men who have shown such an inexorable devotion to the gallows. On their own heads and the heads of their abettors be the blood they so conscientiously and fearlessly shed! Let those petition them, if they will, who voted them and others into office under the oath to execute the laws of war and capital punishment, as occasion may require. Such may petition. But we will protest and denounce. We stand aloof from such a government, and our skirts are clean from its death-dealing deeds. It is a privilege to *die* rather than to *inflict death*—rather than to trample under foot the plain and unequivocal precepts of Jesus Christ. We repeat, let the voters and sworn office-holders petition for commutation of this sentence. And then, if they like, after having been solemnly twitted of a *mawkish sentimentality*, a perverse sympathy with murderers, and indifference to the welfare of the innocent portion of the community, let them keep up the rotation of consistency by voting, taking office, and swearing to uphold the present anti-Christian machinery of society! For our part, we shall strike deeper, though our blows show not their marks till the next century, and though we work in humble obscurity all our life-time. On the heads of them that assume the responsibility of taking human life in war, on the gallows or otherwise, be the *crimson crown* which awaits such executioners. We envy not their dignities, their consciences, their dreams by night, their reflections on reading the divine Sermon of Christ, their death-beds, or their remembrances when they reach the world of spirits. But we will beg no more mercy at their hands for the guilty, till they evince a greater reverence for the authority and law of Jesus Christ. The time is coming when they will do this. But first they must take their fill of the *lex talionis*. Till then, saith the Spirit of the Highest, 'Ephraim is joined to his idols, let him alone.'

* Dr. Webster himself is reported to have been heretofore an ultra Capital Punishment man. It is said that, 'at the time Tirrell was tried for his life, he very severely lectured the benevolent Dr. Walter Channing for the medical testimony he gave in that case, and charged him with letting loose upon the community a man who deserved to be hung.'

For the benefit of very distant readers we may add, that Professor Webster, whose coolness and self-possession never deserted him—save when confronted with the shreds of the human form into which he had converted a living man—spoke out in his own defence, before the final summing up of the Judge. He spoke; but so far as human punishment is concerned, better had it been for him that he had kept closed his lips. Calling God solemnly to witness that he was not the author of certain anonymous letters produced in court, and entering upon petty details on trivial points, he but made passing allusions to his 'trust in God and his own innocence.' He sneered at his counsel for their mismanagement of his defence, but did not dare to call God to witness that he was innocent of the charge laid against him. We trust that he may obtain pardon of his God, for that he is doomed ere long to appear before a higher tribunal than any on earth, there can be no reasonable doubt.

We have penned these remarks under the strong impression that there is injustice and evil in allowing rumors and innuendoes of the 'Boston determination to convict' to pass current without contradiction. We firmly believe that prejudice has in no manner operated in this case; and further, that so far from popular feeling being against the convicted man before his conviction, there would have been much rejoicing if the crime could have been laid at the door of one of the witnesses. To drag down to the depth of infamy the man whom the illustrious Humboldt has so recently quoted as an authority in science, must have been repugnant to those who pride themselves on the intellectual repute of their city. It seems to us that the Jury have done their duty nobly. In England, within a century, cases have occurred in which neither birth, nor learning, nor wealth, could save the criminal from his fate. Here the proof occurs that science and social position serve not to avert the penalties of crime. The name of Professor Webster may be hereafter mentioned, when Earl Ferrers, and Dr. Dodd, and Mr. Fauntleroy are passed in review.

We notice, and cordially rejoice, that the profoundest feeling of pity for the family of Professor Webster is exhibited towards them in their great grief. How should our horror of such crime be increased by a glance toward that agonized household! But the glance should be only with the mind's eye. It is to be hoped that the caterers for the press will respect the sacredness of such unutterable calamity. Let them gloat at pleasure on the *minutiæ* of crime; but in Heaven's name refrain from the sanctuary of unspeakable woe.—*N. Y. Albion.*

We are strongly in hopes that this awful tragedy will lead to the final abolition of hanging in this State. The gallows has stood a good many fierce assaults, but it has been defended as a divine institution, (like slavery, war, and every other abomination,) and it has been so backed up by the property, and *respectability*, and conservatism of the State, that the radicals have seemed to make but little impression upon it. When none but Washington Goodes were to be hung, a large class seemed to think that it was not worth while to make a great fuss about the matter; but the impartiality of the institution is now about to be made manifest, and perhaps new views of its beneficial tendency may gain currency. It is not impossible that Charles Spear may find himself a popular man, after this! We hope it will be so. There is a general supposition that Governor Briggs will not *dare* to take the responsibility of commuting Prof. Webster's sentence. We don't wish to think so hardly of him as this. Washington Goode should have been saved; it was a great error to allow that poor, forsaken victim of ignorance, prejudice and crime to be pursued to the gallows; and that error can be repaired only by extending mercy to Professor Webster, convicted as he has been by Judge-made law, and in opposition to the feelings and opinions of nearly all the people. And let the people instruct their representatives to overrule the law of strangulation, and substitute for it imprisonment. Not a sane word can be said for the gallows. It is neither divine nor human; it is neither right nor expedient; it does not reform the criminal; it does not protect society. It is cruel nonsense, and sooner or later, (as Carlyle says in behalf of the other side of the question,) it will have to be, as is the doom of all nonsense, 'drummed out of the world with due placard stuck on its back, and the populace flinging dead cats at it.' It has got to go, and it may as well go now, before more lives are judicially sacrificed to it.—*N. Y. American.*

London correspondent of the N. Y. Evening Post.

THOMAS CARLYLE.

Speaking of Carlyle reminds me of the unfortunate turn he has taken in his Latter Day Pamphlets. They are the craziest things of the day, and have vastly mortified his little coterie of admirers. He is vomiting forth, like another Vesuvius, red hot streams of lava upon all the humanitarian tendencies of the age. Nor was there a more truculent and bigotted denouncer of all forms of progress, even the most moderate. He actually raves like a bedlamite, frothing at the mouth, and glaring fearfully with hot black eyes.

Some say that Thomas has clean lost his wits; others, that he has betaken himself to unusual potations of the whiskey; but those who look deeper into such things can account for his present manifestation without resorting to these suppositions of mental and moral dislocation. Carlyle has always been a worshipper of Force, and his present opinions are but the logical outgrowth of his tendencies. His first works, the Life of Schiller, some of his Essays, and, as a *jeu d'esprit*, Sartor Resartus, were his best, and ever since then he has been getting more violent, disjointed, burly and savage. Punch notices him in this wise:—

PUNCH'S POLICE.

A VERY MELANCHOLY CASE.

Yesterday, a gentleman of the name of Thomas Carlyle was brought before Mr. Punch, charged with being unable to take care of his own literary reputation—a very first-rate reputation until a few months past, but now, in consequence of the reckless and alarming conduct of the accused, in a most dangerous condition; indeed, in the opinion of very competent authorities, fast sinking.

The office was crowded by many distinguished persons, all of them manifesting the most tender anxiety towards the accused; who, however, did not seem to feel the seriousness of his situation; but, on the contrary, with folded arms and determined expression of visage, called the worthy magistrate (Mr. Punch) a 'windbag,' a 'serf of flunkeydom,' and 'an ape of the Dead Sea.'

John Nokes, a policeman with a literary turn, proved that he had long known the doings of the accused. Witness first became acquainted with him through his 'Life of Schiller,' a work done in the very best and decentest manner, in which no offence whatever was committed against the people's English; for he, John Nokes, had no idea that English should be called either 'king's' or 'queen's,' but emphatically 'the people's English.' Had since known the accused through '*Sartor Resartus*,' 'The French Revolution,' 'Past and Present,' and 'Oliver Cromwell.' From time to time, as he went on, witness had marked, with considerable anxiety, an increasing wildness, a daring eccentricity of manner in the doings of the accused, frequently observing that he delighted to crack and dislocate the joints of language, and to melt down and alloy sterling English into nothing better than German silver. Nevertheless, witness did not believe the reputation of the accused in any positive danger, until some three or four months back, when he detected him running wildly up and down the pages of 'Frazer's Magazine,' pelting all sorts of gibberish at the heads of Jamaica negroes—fantastically reproaching them for being 'up to the ears, content in pumpkins, when they should work for sugar and spices' for their white masters—threatening them with the whip, and, in a word, dealing in language only dear to the heart—witness meant pockets—of Yankee slave owners and Brazilian planters. Since then, witness had named his suspicions to several most respectable publishers, warning them to have an eye upon the offender.

Peter Williams, teacher at the Lamb-and-Flag Ragged School, deposed that he had purchased two numbers of a work by the accused, called 'Latter Day Pamphlets.' The first number appeared to him (witness) to develop rabid symptoms, but in the second, in Model Prisons, there was nothing in it but barking and froth. (Here several passages were read, that fully bore out the opinion of the witness; passages which created a melancholy sensation in court, many persons sighing deeply, and in more than one instance dropping 'some natural tears.')—Witness did not believe it consistent with public safety that, in his present temper, the accused should be trusted with pen and ink. If permitted the use of such dangerous weapons, he would—until recovered from his present indisposition—inevitably inflict upon his reputation a mischief from which it could not recover. As it was, witness considered it far from safe.

Mr. Punch asked the accused if he had any thing to say; whereupon accused, with a withering smile, replied:—

'Preternatural Eternal Oceans'—'Inhuman Humanitarians'—'Eiderdown Philanthropy'—'Wide-reverberating Cant'—'Work Sans Holiday'—'Three Cheers more, and Eternal, Inimitable, and Antipodean Fraternity'—'Pumpkindom, Flunkeydom, Foolscapdom, and Pen-and-Inkdom!'

Mr. Punch observed, this was a melancholy case. He could not release the accused, unless upon good and sufficient surety. Whereupon two gentlemen—publishers of the first respectability—declared themselves willing to be bound, that the accused should not, until in a more healthful frame of mind, be allowed the use of paper and goosequills.

It is believed that if accused again offend, the whole body of publishers will insist on his compulsory silence. Let us, however, hope better things.

A great meeting was held at the London Tavern recently, to denounce the atrocious massacre committed by the English force under the authority of Rajah Brooke on the coast of Borneo. A detail of the circumstances connected with this relentless and savage deed was laid before the meeting by Rev. Henry Richard; and the most ample evidence was adduced to show that this destruction of life had been effected upon a suspicion exceedingly vague and indefinite—that the parties destroyed were or had been pirates. A Capt. Aaron Smith stood up to defend Rajah Brooke, and narrated his own adventures with pirates as a justification of any barbarities practised upon the inhabitants of the Bornean seas. There was a racy, free-and-easy sort of style about the sea cpatain that pleased many of the audience, and at first he bid fair for popularity; but when George Thompson in reply dealt with the Captain's heroics, and brought them to the test of common equity and humanity, the poor fellow's self-possession sadly evaporated, and the feeling of the meeting went so completely against him, that not a single hand was held up in approbation of the resolution submitted from the platform. The Times, however, true to its principles in favor of despotic power, and glad always to have its fling at the friends of peace, gave a report of this meeting the next morning, in which it carefully suppressed the evidence given by Mr. Richard and George Thompson, whilst it gave the Captain's speech in extenso, with running comments of its own intended to show that the Captain had completely reversed the sentiments of the meeting, and dumb-founded the men of peace. Unfortunately, however, for the Times, it turned out that its protege Captain Aaron Smith was the identical man who had been himself twice tried at the Old Bailey on charges of piracy, and being only acquitted on the plea that he had acted from compulsion. Mr. Hume has moved in the House of Commons for full information connected with this massacre.

Salt Mine Discovered. A salt mine has been discovered near Woodstock, Lower Canada. It is said the mine will yield sufficient to supply the whole of Western Canada.

☞ In round numbers, the distance from New York to San Francisco is sixteen hundred miles greater by the Panama than the Tehuantepec route, and ten hundred greater than by the canal route of Nicaragua, which last route is six hundred miles shorter than the Panama.

☞ The New York Tribune begins its tenth year on a permanently enlarged sheet, printed in quarto form. It now prints 15,000 daily, 1600 semi-weekly, and 39,000 weekly.

Boston California Fleet.—The whole number of vessels cleared from Boston for California, since the first discovery of gold up to this time, is 203—viz., 72 ships, 60 barques, 49 brigs, 22 schooners. Probably these vessels have carried out some 2,500 passengers, and about $5,000,000 in freight.

Large Snake.—The Maulmein Times of Oct. 23d states that, on the previous Tuesday, a large snake, measuring fifteen feet six inches, was killed by Lieutenant West, of the 11th regiment Madras native infantry.

Expenses of a Diplomatist in London.—Abbot Lawrence is stated to have taken the elegant mansion of Lord Cadogan, opposite Green Park, in London, at a rent of $10,000 per annum, being $1000 more than his whole salary!!

☞ The following petition was recently presented, addressed to our State Senate and House of Representatives:—

SIRS—I wish to have my name changed to that of Franklin Macy, instead of Stephen Macy, being a relative of the illustrious Dr. Franklin, and *having a mind like his.* Which your petitioner will ever pray.

STEPHEN MACY.